FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 232

3 December 1985

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Summit Seen as 'Important Start' Toward Accords [PRAVDA 3 Dec] AA 1
Observance of Geneva Accords Will Improve Climate [SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 26 Nov] AA 3
Summit Laid Foundations for Change, Dialogue [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 26 Nov] AA 4
Summit Seen as Positive Point in Arms Control [ZA RUBEZHOM No 48] AA 6

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' [Primokov, Shishlin, Levin] CC 1
Purpose of Special GATT Committee Disputed CC 8

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Responsibility for Better Relations Lies With U.S. [Genri in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 Nov] A 1
Summit Continues To Exert Favorable Impact [Vasilyev in PRAVDA 29 Nov] A 3
U.S. Leads Technology Blockade in 'Economic War' [NEW TIMES] A 6
U.S. Increases Naval Presence in Mediterranean A 6

CHINA

PRC Foreign Ministry Delegation Visits Kiev [PRAVDA UKRAINY 20 Nov] B 1
IL-86 Aircraft on Demonstration Flights in PRC [IZVESTIYA 28 Nov] B 1
Cinematography Delegation Holds Talks in Beijing [IZVESTIYA 25 Nov] B 2
Writers, Women's Cultural Delegations Visit PRC B 2
Chinese Writers Delegation Visit Reported B 2
Soviet Literature Praised B 2
Visits Leningrad B 3
Tours Georgian Republic B 4
LITERATURNAYA GAZETA on Life, Changes in China [20 Nov] B 4

WESTERN EUROPE

FRG Bundestag Delegation Visits Leningrad G 1
Tolkunov Confers With FRG Ambassador 29 Nov [IZVESTIYA 30 Nov] G 1

Swedish Communist Workers Party Group Visits G 1
[PRAVDA 1 Dec]
Nuclear Weapons, Relations With Turkey Examined G 2
[Istanbul CUMHURIYET 27 Nov]
Presidium, Ministers Hail Turkish National Day G 3
[IZVESTIYA 30 Nov]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Further Reportage on Mugabe Visit to Moscow J 1
PRAVDA Report J 1
[2 Dec]
Talks With Ryzhkov J 1
Meets Gromyko J 2
Kremlin Dinner J 3
Ryzhkov Speech J 4
Mugabe Speech J 4
Further on Dinner J 5
Meets Gorbachev J 6
Ponomarev Receives Senegal Party Delegation J 6
[PRAVDA 1 Dec]
CPSU Delegation Attends MPLA Congress J 7
Central Committee Greets MPLA Congress J 7
[PRAVDA 2 Dec]
Briefs: USSR Red Cross Aid J 8

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Further Reportage on USSR Supreme Soviet R 1
Balmont Address [IZVESTIYA 29 Nov] R 1
S.A. Afanasyev Speech [IZVESTIYA 29 Nov] R 2
PRAVDA Editorial [29 Nov] R 4
IZVESTIYA Editorial [29 Nov] R 7
Sizenko Appointed Minister R 9
Correction to Text of State Budget Law R 9
PRAVDA Publishes Gorbachev Supreme Soviet Speech R 10
[28 Nov]

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

TV Program Examines Scientific-Technical Progress U 1
Briefs: Automated Design System; Kazakhstan Computer Center U 28

SUMMIT SEEN AS 'IMPORTANT START' TOWARD ACCORDS

PM021700 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 85 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "For the Sake of Peace"]

[Text] The contemporary period is typified by the activation in every possible way of the USSR's peace-loving policy over the broadest front of international relations. This policy is aimed at ending the arms race without delay; galvanizing the disarmament process; developing equal, correct, and civilized relations among states; and expanding and deepening mutually advantageous economic ties.

The Geneva summit between the leaders of the USSR and the United States occupies a prominent place in the Soviet Union's efforts to collaborate with a wide range of states for the benefit of peace. Our country went to the summit without the slightest illusions about U.S. policy, but well aware that the situation in the world is too dangerous to ignore even the slightest chance of rectifying it and moving toward a more stable and lasting peace. Even before the summit the Soviet Union did virtually everything to break the dangerous course of events by dint of example and argument and to make the political climate more favorable for the summit.

As a result, the Geneva summit was undoubtedly a significant event. In our present complex times the dialogue between the two leaders was in itself a stabilizing factor.

The main issue and the core of the Geneva talks was the question of war and peace and arms limitation. The CPSU Central Committee Politburo noted that a fundamentally important result of the summit was the fact that the leaders of the USSR and the United States stated in their joint document that nuclear war must not be unleashed. They stressed the importance of preventing any war -- nuclear or conventional -- between the USSR and the United States and pledged not to strive to achieve military superiority.

The USSR and the United States clearly reaffirmed their commitment to promote the growth in every possible way of the effectiveness of the regime for the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and came out jointly in favor of the universal and total prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. The accord to promote the speediest successful completion of the Stockholm conference also goes far beyond the bounds of Soviet-U.S. relations.

As a result of the summit, a number of useful accords have appeared in many avenues of the development of USSR-U.S. bilateral cooperation. They will serve as a good base to raise the level of trust between our countries and peoples. The security sphere and its nucleus -- the prevention of the militarization of space and nuclear arms reduction -- will continue to determine USSR-U.S. mutual relations.

Of course, the long-term significance of all the useful things agreed upon in Geneva can only be seen in specific practical matters. First and foremost, it will be necessary to focus efforts on unraveling [razvyazka] the most important questions which were not resolved at the summit, specifically the questions linked with the task of ending the arms race. The U.S. leadership's reluctance to abandon the "star wars" program prevented any specific accords being reached in Geneva on real disarmament and first and foremost, on the central problem of nuclear and space arms.

The Soviet side presented a set of profound arguments which must help the U.S. leadership find the will and determination to assess objectively the USSR's foreign policy positions and, primarily, to perceive all the pernicious aspects of the "star wars" program. This program is the main obstacle on the path to the radical reduction of nuclear arms.

The accord on the need to prevent an arms race in space and terminate it on earth reached in January 1985 at the level of the USSR and U.S. foreign ministers and now confirmed by the leaders of the states, must remain the reference point in the quest for mutually acceptable solutions. The will expressed at the summit to accelerate this work at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms is of particular significance. The entire world will follow the progress in this work with intense attention.

New meetings of the USSR and U.S. leaders lie ahead. To avoid hindering the achievement of future accords, it is necessary to refrain from everything that would undermine what was achieved in Geneva, from actions which would block talks and erode limiters [ogranichiteli] of the arms race, like the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems and the relevant provisions of the SALT II treaty. The United States ought to heed the demand of the world community and, like the USSR, announce a moratorium on nuclear tests.

The main point in the approach to the new summit meeting is to create opportunities for really terminating the arms race and embarking on practical steps to reduce nuclear arsenals. Preparations must begin right now.

"...For its part," M.S. Gorbachev declared at the USSR Supreme Soviet session, "the Soviet Union intends not to slacken the pace and to aim for a curtailment of the arms race and a general improvement of the international situation with all determination and in a spirit of honest cooperation with the United States. We expect a similar approach to be displayed by the United States."

The USSR Supreme Soviet, having examined at its session the results of the summit meeting and the international situation, noted in a special resolution that the Soviet power's [derzhava] course of strengthening trust between all states and developing constructive cooperation, together with its commitment to seek solutions to even the most complex problems by political means and through talks -- a course which was vividly displayed in the activity of the USSR delegation at the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva -- enjoys the ardent support of the Soviet people and the unanimous approval of the Soviet Union's friends and allies, encounters broad understanding among responsible statesmen and politicians, and is perceived with hope by the world's peoples.

And so, an important start has been made. It can become the fulcrum for a turnabout from senseless and dangerous confrontation to international detente. The Geneva meeting has enabled the peoples to gain a deeper understanding of responsibility for the fate of peace and of the need to act more energetically. They are justified in expecting practical deeds from responsible statesmen. Then the work done in Geneva will not have been in vain, the peoples' hopes for a more lasting peace will be justified, and good-neighborliness and peaceful cooperation will become the norms of international life.

OBSERVANCE OF GENEVA ACCORDS WILL IMPROVE CLIMATE

PM261653 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 26 Nov 85 p 1

[Editorial: "A Step Toward Peace"]

[Text] For the first time in the last 6 and 1/2 years a meeting was held in Geneva between the leaders of the two great powers -- the Soviet Union and the United States -- which bear the main responsibility for the fate of the world. It took place at the moment when mankind found itself on the edge of the nuclear abyss and had to stop, look around, think carefully, and decide what to do next. This is a most crucial moment in world history, when the questions of war and peace, and the questions of survival and control over disarmament are of paramount importance. It is precisely for this reason that many mass news media have called the meeting between M. S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan historic.

Even before the appearance of the Republicans in the White House, Soviet-U.S. relations were not distinguished by great warmth, and with the arrival of the present administration they deteriorated to the extreme. Our people and the entire socialist community have had threats and insults thrown at them from the other side of the ocean. The so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" has begun to be implemented at top speed in the United States, although no one has been able to clearly explain why this initiative ended up in the hands of the dealers in death. And, whereas in the "star wars" of the fantasists, whence those in the Pentagon have borrowed this term, a struggle is waged by the whole of mankind against an invading alien civilization, the Pentagon has begun to prepare a "star war" against the socialist countries.

That is why the world followed so closely the course of the 3-day meeting on the shore of Lake Geneva. The talks between the leaders of the two great countries were frank, protracted, and intense. They made it possible to more clearly understand the nature of existing differences, remove certain preconceived opinions in relation to the USSR, and clear away some accumulated prejudices.

Both leaders agreed on the necessity to improve Soviet-U.S. relations and to make the international situation as a whole healthier. They agreed to maintain a political dialogue so as to better understand one another and, on this basis, to seek mutually acceptable solutions to the vital problems of the day. With this aim it was deemed essential to meet again in the near future, no longer in neutral Geneva, but in the capitals of the two powers -- the USSR and the United States -- in turn. The dialogue between the USSR minister of foreign affairs and the U.S. secretary of state will be stepped up, as will the dialogue between the leaders of other ministries and departments.

Both leaders solemnly stated that they would not aspire to military superiority and they would not permit a war to be unleased between the USSR and the United States, either nuclear or conventional, because any conflict between them may have catastrophic consequences. They advocated the swiftest progress particularly where there are points of contact, including appropriate application of the principle of a 50-percent reduction in the nuclear weapons of both states and the idea of an intermediate agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe.

All this creates opportunities for better mutual understanding and for advancing along the path of clearing away the obstructions of "cold war."

However, the Geneva meeting must not be either overestimated or underestimated. "We must be realists," M.S. Gorbachev stated, "and say directly: At this meeting we did not succeed in finding a solution to the most important issues connected with the task of halting the arms race and strengthening peace; major differences on fundamental issues still remain between us."

The existence of such differences is explained by the fact that the U.S. side continues to stubbornly insist on realizing its "Strategic Defense Initiative," which embodies the long-standing hegemonist plans of the most aggressive U.S. imperialist circles, primarily of the military-industrial complex. In the words of THE NEW YORK TIMES, the Soviet proposal to reduce weapons by half "caused an instantaneous spasm among the largest weapons producers," who regarded this as "a threatened loss of tens of billions of dollars."

Mankind has also not forgotten the cynical revelation of the "father of the hydrogen bomb," E. Teller: "The story that SDI is designed to help liquidate nuclear weapons on earth was thought up for domestic consumption within the United States, in order to strike a blow at the antiwar movement and to force it to reconcile itself to SDI." Now this story has been dragged out for external consumption, obviously counting on simpletons. But, totally unexpectedly for the U.S. Administration and the man in the street lulled by its rosy promises, scientists the world over, including its own scientists -- the Federation of American Scientists, Princeton University, and a number of other serious scientific centers -- have risen up sharply against this bluff. It is clear to everyone that whoever strives to carry the arms race into outer space is not interested in peace on earth.

The Soviet Union has countered the nuclear insanity of "star wars" with the constructive concept of "star peace," by proposing a complete ban on space-based strike weapons. In the nuclear age, security -- the central problem in relations between our countries at the contemporary stage -- more than ever before can only be general, collective security. In the face of the nuclear threat the USSR and the United States are faced with a dilemma: to survive or to perish together. There is no third alternative.

Preparing for the 27th CPSU Congress, Soviet people fully approve of the results of the Geneva summit negotiations. This is also the position of the working people throughout the entire socialist community, which was clearly demonstrated at the meeting of the top leaders of the Warsaw Pact states in Prague.

Geneva has begun a dialogue between the leaders of the two great powers. If the accords reached -- which are set out in the Soviet-U.S. joint statement -- are strictly observed by both sides, then this will inevitably lead to an improvement in the political atmosphere throughout the world.

SUMMIT LAID FOUNDATIONS FOR CHANGE, DIALOGUE

PM261201 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 26 Nov 85 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Responsibility for the Future of the World"]

[Text] The development of the international situation is at a difficult stage. The objective course of world developments has itself placed questions of war and peace, questions of survival, at the center of world politics. In resolving these vitally important problems, the CPSU proceeds on the basis that the historical dispute between the two opposing social systems into which the modern world is divided can and must be resolved by peaceful means. Socialism demonstrates its advantages not by force of arms, but by force of example in all spheres of public life. As the draft new edition of the CPSU Program stresses, "the USSR does not encroach on any country's security -- in West or East. It does not threaten anyone, it does not seek confrontation with any state, it wants to live in peace with all countries. Since the time of Great October, the Soviet socialist state has borne aloft the banner of peace and friendship among peoples. The CPSU will continue to preserve its loyalty to this Leninist banner." The party adheres unswervingly to this principled line in foreign policy.

As was noted at the CPSU Central Committee Politburo session, the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva was a major political event in international life. On the eve of the Geneva meeting, the Soviet Union did everything to lay the foundations for mutual understanding and improve the political atmosphere. The USSR unilaterally stopped all nuclear explosions, expressing readiness immediately to resume talks on a complete end to nuclear tests. The unilateral moratorium on antisatellite weapon tests was also confirmed, and radical proposals on reducing nuclear arsenals were submitted. The Soviet proposals to prevent the arms race from being transferred to space were accompanied by proposals on the development of the broadest international cooperation on the peaceful exploration and utilization of space for the benefit of all peoples. In the run-up to the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, a session of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee was held in Sofia. The whole planet heard the voice of the socialist countries speaking in defense of peace, the relaxation of tension, and cooperation; against the arms race; against confrontation; and for the improvement of the international situation in the interests of all peoples of the earth.

In the course of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, the constructive Soviet stance, dictated by a sense of responsibility for the future of the world, was again confirmed. "We considered it necessary to try by force of argument, by force of example, by force of common sense to break the dangerous course of events," M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, noted at the press conference for journalists covering the Soviet-U.S. meeting. "This was our conclusion: The time has come, under the threat of the universal nuclear danger, to learn the great art of living together. Both our Soviet people and, I am deeply convinced, the U.S. people are equally interested in this. All the peoples of the world have an interest in it."

Much work was done in Geneva. The major problems of USSR-U.S. relations and the present-day situation in the world were discussed. Great significance is attached to the fact that the Soviet-U.S. accord achieved in January 1985 on the need to seek ways of preventing an arms race in space and stopping the arms race on earth was confirmed. The joint statement contained in the concluding document of the Geneva meeting on the impermissibility of nuclear war and on the sides' renunciation of the attainment of military superiority is of fundamental importance. The great significance of the Geneva meeting also lies in the fact that it laid the foundations for dialogue with a view to achieving changes for the better in Soviet-U.S. relations, and, indeed, in the world in general.

In the course of the Geneva meeting, both sides reaffirmed the intention to improve USSR-U.S. relations and promote the lessening of the threat of nuclear war, the prevention of the race for strike arms in space, and its ending on earth. True, this meeting could not find solutions to the most important questions connected with the task of ending the arms race and strengthening peace. Major differences continue to exist between the USSR and the United States on questions of principle. But the two states' leaders agreed that work to seek mutually acceptable solutions to these very important questions will be continued in Geneva by representatives of the USSR and the United States. There will also be a search for new forms of the development of bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations. And there will be further consultations on a number of regional problems. As Comrade M.S. Gorbachev stressed, the Soviet Union for its part "will make every effort, in cooperation with the United States, to seek the practical resolution of the tasks of curbing the arms race, reducing the stockpiled arsenals, and ensuring the conditions for lasting peace between our peoples, reliable peace on earth and in space."

The results of the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan generally create more favorable opportunities for improving the international situation and returning to detente. This was the assessment given by the top leaders of the Warsaw Pact states at their meeting in Prague on 21 November 1985.

They fully supported the constructive stance set forth by M.S. Gorbachev at the talks with R. Reagan in the spirit of the joint line expressed in the Warsaw Pact states' 23 October 1985 statement. At the Prague meeting the top leaders of the fraternal parties and countries assessed highly the extremely important contribution made by M.S. Gorbachev in the course of the Geneva meeting to the advancement of the socialist community countries' jointly elaborated peace-loving positions.

The principled course of the allied socialist states toward the elimination of the threat of nuclear war, the ending of the arms race on earth and the prevention of its spreading to space, the transition to real disarmament measures, and the strengthening of universal peace was again confirmed in Prague. The Warsaw Pact states stated once again that they do not seek military superiority, but will not permit superiority over them. Acting in coordination, the top leaders of the fraternal parties and countries declared their determination to continue to do everything in their power to achieve a change for the better in European and world affairs.

In the course of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, the Soviet Union once again demonstrated to all the world's peoples its unshakable determination to seek lasting peace and international security and the establishment of businesslike, good-neighborly relations between states. This foreign policy course of the Communist Party and the Soviet state meets with the warm approval and unanimous support of all Soviet people. Soviet Armed Forces servicemen share the people's thoughts and feelings. In a the present complex international situation, they see it as their duty to persistently master the combat hardware and weapons entrusted to them; to improve field, air, and sea training; and to strengthen organization and discipline.

SUMMIT SEEN AS POSITIVE POINT IN ARMS CONTROL

PM261505 Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM in Russian No 48, 22-28 Nov 85 (Signed to Press 21 Nov 85) p 1

[Editorial: "Geneva -- an Important Beginning"]

[Text] Geneva! Not only in Europe, at whose center this city is located, but on all continents its name has been repeated many times a day in recent weeks, and in particular during these days in press, radio, and television reports, in speeches by statesmen and politicians, and in ordinary people's conversations. Descriptions of the meeting between the Soviet and U.S. leaders have almost totally squeezed out other events from the pages of U.S., West European, and many other newspapers and in radio and television broadcasts.

Large meetings and rallies, regional and national conferences, and international forums sent the participants in the Geneva meeting addresses, appeals, and calls containing insistent wishes, requests, and demands to reach agreement on what all the peoples were hoping for and expecting -- the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe, the curbing of the arms race, and the improvement of the international climate. Numerous authoritative delegations, authorized by millions and millions of people seriously concerned at the danger of nuclear war, came to Geneva with similar demands. The urgent need to remove the danger posed to all mankind by a further increase in nuclear arms was also emphasized in messages from the UN secretary general and the leaders of the governments of India, Canada, and other countries. Even the governments of a number of U.S. allies, which usually obligingly support Washington's policy, found it necessary to openly voice their opinion that the first Soviet-U.S. summit meeting after a 6-year gap must end in definite progress and advances in this main direction.

Main Direction

The chief purpose of the meeting was predetermined by the alarming situation which has taken shape in the world. The unrestrained nuclear arms race, whipped up by Washington over the past 5 years, posed a real threat to mankind's existence. The stockpiles of nuclear weapons are sufficient to destroy all living things on our planet many times over, to turn it into a dead desert for many centuries, and to cause irreparable harm to its atmosphere (the "nuclear winter"). The encirclement of the USSR and its allies with a ring of U.S. air and naval bases with nuclear weapons, the plans for a "limited" nuclear war in Europe, and the recent deployment in a number of West European countries of U.S. missiles capable of inflicting a first strike within 6-8 minutes have sharply increased international tension. This tension has increased still more with the start of extensive and multifaceted U.S. preparations for the militarization of space with the manifest aim of dominating it and achieving superiority over and imposing its will on the Soviet Union.

The Soviet leadership, firmly declaring and repeatedly confirming that it will not permit this, has also repeatedly voiced the desire to halt the nuclear arms race, to lighten the burden of military expenditure, which is complicating the already critical state of the world economy, to improve the international climate, and, above all, to normalize relations between the biggest and most powerful industrial and military powers -- the USSR and the United States. In order to prove its good will not just in words but also in deeds, the USSR unilaterally introduced a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe, removed some of its SS-20 missiles from combat duty, and stopped all nuclear explosions, thereby halting all nuclear weapon tests.

Shortly before the Geneva meeting the Soviet Union suggested to the United States a 50-percent reduction in nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory, the abandonment of the militarization of space, and a limit on the number of warheads to 6,000 for each country, thereby ensuring identical security. At the same time the Soviet side proposes the abandonment of programs for the creation [sozdaniye] and deployment of new strategic offensive arms, maximum limitation on the modernization of existing arms, a total ban on long-range cruise missiles, a halt to all work on the creation [sozdaniye] of space strike arms, and end to the testing and deployment of new kinds and types of nuclear arms, an end to the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe and the establishment of a mutual moratorium on all nuclear explosions.

"We propose," M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said, "very simple and clear things: to reduce by half the corresponding nuclear arms of the Soviet Union and the United States; to shut tight the door leading to the deployment of weapons in space; to halt and reverse the accumulation of nuclear missiles in Europe." This simple and clear program is entirely shared and supported not only by the Soviet people and their colleagues in the socialist countries, but also by all sober-minded politicians and public figures and by the working people of Europe, America, and other continents.

Opposite Course

The U.S. ruling elite, at whose core is the military-industrial complex, not only resisted the curbing of the nuclear arms race, but also tangibly stepped it up when the present administration acceded to power. Washington secured from an obedient Congress the allocation of almost $2 trillion for major new nuclear arms programs. Simultaneously, with the creation and deployment of a number of systems in the United States, the Pentagon accelerated the deployment in West European countries of first-strike nuclear missiles targeted on the USSR and its allies.

Washington rejected without serious examination or discussion all the Soviet proposals to end the nuclear arms race, hiding behind spurious talk of Soviet "superiority" and U.S. "backwardness." The specific Soviet steps in this sphere were irresponsibly branded as "propaganda" or were simply ignored. The United States responded to the Soviet mornatorium on the deployment of nuclear missiles in Europe by hastily deploying its own Pershing-2 missiles in the FRG and cruise missiles in Britain, Italy, and Belgium. As though scoffing at the expectations of the international public, the Pentagon, which is in the hands of direct henchmen of U.S. military-industrial monopolies, delivered new cruise missiles to Britain the day before the Geneva meeting started.

Direct interference by the U.S. military-industrial complex affected the stance taken by the U.S. side in Geneva. According to The NEW YORK TIMES, the proposal for an arms reduction "brought on an instantaneous spasm in the biggest arms producers," who saw this as a "threatened loss of tens of billions of dollars ." Expressing their will, the defense secretary demanded that the President, in point of fact, wreck the necessary and proper discussion of the chief problem at the meeting -- the prevention of an arms race in space and its ending on earth.

The different approaches of the Soviet Union and the United States to the most important present-day problem, on which mankind's future depends, prevented the removal or even the lessening of the danger hanging over the world. The nuclear arms race will not be ended, and the U.S. desire to transfer the arms race to space continues to threaten the security of not only the Soviet people, but also all other peoples of our planet.

The meeting between the Soviet and U.S. leaders -- M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and President R. Reagan -- together with the Soviet-U.S. joint statement adopted by them, with a number of important practical measures, and the other accords reached by them map out the general direction of the joint efforts wjich could be crowned with fruitful results and lead to an improvement both in Soviet-U.S. relations and in the sitaution in Europe and throughout the world.

At his press conference in Geneva M.S. Gorbachev exhaustively set forth the Soviet assessment of the situation in the modern world and the USSR's stance at the meeting, outlined the nature of the politically acute and direct talks, and, noting the positive significance of the meeting between the leaders of the two greatest powers, specially emphasized that through the joint efforts of the USSR, the United States, and other states it is possible and necessary to impart to the development of events in the world not a destructive, but a creative direction. This is what all peoples wait and hope for.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD011946 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 1 Dec 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, director of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations; political observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, and All-Union Radio commentator Viktor Nikolayevich Levin]

'Necessary, Useful' Summit

[Text] [Levin] Hello, esteemed listeners! Ten days have already elapsed since the end of the summit meeting in Geneva, but the subject continues to dominate the world press, and indeed the life of our country, as was shown by the USSR Supreme Soviet session at which there was a broad discussion of the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit. As you know, Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, delivered a major report, debates were held, and the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted a decision noting that at the current crucial stage in international relations and at a time when mankind is faced with the choice between survival and the threat of destruction, the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting was necessary and useful. Taking part in our program today, as you already know, are Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov and political observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin. They managed to see Geneva, as they say, from the inside, by being there during the summit meeting. In this light, of course, their impressions are of particular interest.

[Shishlin] It would be appropriate to say a few words about the results of the meeting also. There is no need to try to show that the Soviet-U.S. summit itself was a substantial event; but the results, the final consequences of the Geneva meeting will, I think, manifest themselves not tomorrow or the day after, but will have an overall effect in the next few months and perhaps years. To get straight to the point, we should view the Geneva meeting, which was an event of truly world importance, not in light of the usual assessments of victories, defeats, success, or lack of success...

[Levin interrupts] You mean who was successful and who was beaten, yes, that is the wrong attitude.

[Shishlin] Yes, rather from the point of view of its essence. There were many things that dictated the need for that meeting; but perhaps the most overbearing was the fact -- and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has already spoken of this -- that we now in fact have reached the point in international life where we simply have to stop, take a look around, evaluate the situation, and take steps to reduce the danger of war, to overcome this growth in international tension, and return to the path of detente. The meeting was businesslike, undoubtedly businesslike. It was frank, frank to the utmost. It was useful, undoubtedly useful. But, if you put the question differently, and ask whether at the Geneva meeting they managed to solve what could have been solved, then the answer would probably be in the negative.

[Primakov] Well, I do not altogether agree with that, because it would have been difficult to expect any specific decisions to be made in Geneva during that first meeting. The talks lasted a total of 15 hours, 5 hours of which were spent in private meetings. That is both a lot and a little. Then, in order to solve specific questions, what you need, of course, is for a certain positive potential to have accumulated in relations. That is how I would put it. To solve things straight out, just like that, is very difficult. I do not think that any serious politician expected that any specific questions to do with strategic arms would be solved; so I would not say the word no.

[Shishlin] I would argue a little with you on that. What I had in mind here was the wide-scale plans for switching the arms race into space. Here, from the point of view of the fundamental approach to this problem, there was in fact no understanding.

SDI 'Toy' in Reagan's Hand

[Primakov] No, there was no understanding; and it would have been difficult to convert Reagan, so to speak, during those 15 hours of talks, whatever the arguments put forward to him. I am sure that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev expressed all his arguments to him, and in quite a strong way. But, at the same time, you know that Reagan holds in his hands the Strategic Defense Initiative, as he calls it. Incidentally, he is now afraid of the name "star wars." He opposes it, precisely because the term fully reflects that idea. He prefers to speak of SDI, of some sort of defense system, but it is a toy in his hands: He wants to go down in history with it; and of course in 15 hours of talks, it would seen impossible to put him off it, impossible. But at the same time, I think that he did start thinking about what was said to him.

[Shishlin] At least one would like to believe that.

[Primakov] It was not only he who started thinking; but perhaps even more, those who in fact have a negative attitude toward the SDI. Not everything is so straightforward in the United States. There is a quite influential group of people there: for example, six former U.S. defense secretaries signed a letter of support for the SDI. Many people realize that this idea may lead to complete destabilization, to chaos in international relations, as Mikhail Sergeyevich said. After Geneva, that group, is, I think, becoming more active.

[Shishlin] I can agree with that, of course, because the asset side of the Geneva meeting probably turned out, in a certain respect, to be even greater than expected. At least from the point of view of the purely practical accords and the statements of principle that were made by the leaders of both countries, those statements of principle are of a binding nature, not just for our country, but for the United States as well.

[Levin] The renunciation of nuclear war as a means of solving political problems, the recognition...

[Shishlin interrupts] Not only nuclear, both nuclear and conventional...

[Levin interrupts] ...to prevent war....

[Shishlin interrupts] ...to prevent war in general between the USSR and the United States.

[Levin] In addition, it also is recorded in the joint Soviet-U.S. statement that the talks being held in Geneva on nuclear weapon reductions should pursue strictly the aim that was clearly stated in the January accord: that is, to prevent the creation [sozdaniye] of space strike weapons.

[Primakov] Yes, the point is that the January accord has been elevated to the very top and now has been signed by the leaders of the two countries. That already gives it a qualitatively new significance. At the same time, another very important thing was recorded, in that the sides renounced attempts to gain a military advantage. The United States is, by means of the SDI and other methods, trying to gain that advantage. I, of course, do not remotely think that over the period of a few days the United States has changed. That of course has not happened. But the summit meeting in Geneva was extremely necessary, and it was without a doubt useful, without a doubt.

'Foundation for 1986'

[Shishlin] Yes. Returning to the asset side of that meeting -- but not without reservations -- returning to the asset side, aside from the political statements recorded in the joint Soviet-U.S. document, it is probably worth pointing out to our listeners the fact that both the U.S. President and the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee agreed that there has to be an acceleration in the talks being held in Geneva, those talks which embrace the whole range of problems, be it the prevention of an arms race in space or the problem of ending that race on earth. The joint Soviet-U.S. document records the desire by the sides also to promote progress at the Vienna talks on reducing arms and armed forces in Central Europe. It also reflects the desire by the sides to promote the success of the Stockholm conference on security and confidence-building measures. So, although one cannot place an unequivocal plus sign in front of what they managed to achieve and what transpired as a result of that profound exchange of opinions during the 2 days of the Geneva talks, what was done nevertheless creates a sort of foundation for 1986.

[Primakov] The point also is that the Soviet Union provided those talks with a constructive base; and it will be very difficult for the United States to move off that base, those foundations. It will find it much more difficult than before. We are not dramatizing the different attitude between the sides toward the question of a 50-percent reduction in strategic arms and the U.S. proposal on that question. It may not suit us, and quite justifiably; but despite that we are not dramatizing things. We will search for some sort of compromise solutions based on bringing the positions closer together. Now it depends on the United States: If it also searches for a way to bring the positions closer together, then the talks on the 50-percent reduction may lead to success.

[Shishlin] Yes. And what is very important here is that the Soviet position with regard to strict control of decisions made on arms reduction has been disclosed in full. That position is absolutely constructive.

Question of 'Control'

[Primakov] You have just touched upon a very important issue. For what is it that we have always been accused of -- of allegedly seeking to steer clear of control? But what have they left now? For what will they reproach us now? What will they accuse of of now? We say we are ready for control, ready for all forms control, but only if what are involved are really solutions to stop the arms race. If the arms race continues, then there are no grounds for negotiating on control; that is wholly clear. But if we negotiate -- Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said that in this case by all means, let there be control even on an international basis -- we are ready, as he said, to open up our laboratories also if we come to an agreement on not introducing weapons into space. Now their arguments will be very weak, you understand. This is why I say that it is very important that we should not only establish the desire, but should also put together a specific constructive base for this forthcoming agreement. This is very important.

[Shishlin] I agree with this; but I would like to add a further consideration, on a matter of principle: namely, that the Soviet Union, as Mikhail Sergeyevich declared, has no interest in the United States enjoying less security than the Soviet Union, just as we think that the United States should adhere to a similar approach. This is a very important position of principle; for, if we want to maintain international stability, and secure this international stability at an increasingly low level of armament, then only that kind of approach opens the way for adopting political and practical solutions relating to these problems of stopping the arms race.

[Primakov] This, in effect, creates a new philosophy of international relations. There is a theory of a game with a zero result, as it is called. There are some primitive politicians who feel that whatever is advantageous to the United States, for instance, must perforce be to our disadvantage; and vice versa, what is advantageous to us is perforce to the disadvantage of the United States. This is an instance of the so-called game with a zero result. This theory is well-known. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev totally refuted this way of going on, and proposed concerting interests, proposed finding areas of coinciding national interests; this means, it goes without saying, the objective interests and not the interests of any particular groups in the United States or of individuals -- that is, the national interests of the United States. So, he proposed finding the areas in which these interests coincide with the interests of the Soviet Union. When he said that it is, in fact, to our advantage that the United States should feel secure, this is the correct approach to international relations. This is the only correct approach at the present time.

U.S. Reaction to Moratorium

[Levin] I would like to return to an issue we have already touched on briefly, but which deserves greater attention, it seems to me: that is the issue of the moratorium on conducting nuclear explosions. As is known, the Soviet Union put a stop to all nuclear explosions on 6 August. At that time we proposed that the United States join us in this. We said that our moratorium would remain in effect until the end of 1985, but that it would be extended if the United States backed up our initiative. We are aware of the U.S. first reaction: We declare a moratorium, and within a few days they carry out a fresh underground nuclear explosion in Nevada. Yet, Comrade Gorbachev's report at the Supreme Soviet session contained the clear and resounding idea that our moratorium remains in force; and our invitation to the United States to join us in this also remains in force.

[Shishlin] Only with a proviso, insofar as our moratorium lasts until 1 January.

[Levin] Quite true. I was just about to say that the United States still has a month for reflection, as it is called. Incidentally, in regard to the control issue, Mikhail Sergeyevich mentions that we have registered, using our own national means, an underground nuclear explosion by the United States which it has not announced. Nevertheless, we say that national means can indeed operate; but if you insist on other methods of control, then, as you like, there are no questions from our side.

[Primakov] The main thing is to stop nuclear tests.

[Levin] Quite true. And what does stopping nuclear tests mean? On the political level, it improves the situation. But, it is of great significance with respect to the military aspect, too. Nuclear weapons just will not be developed, not at all.

[Primakov] There will be no further qualitative improvement in nuclear weapons, and then altogether, there will be no attempts to advance into any new spheres.

[Levin] And security will not be undermined; no attempts will be made to attain superiority over the other side. That is, once again, to return to the same fundamental issue we have been talking about.

[Shishlin] But speaking of this new philosophy, which is being engendered in the approach to international relations -- and it is very true that this really is being engendered and that it is present in the practical deeds and the political actions of the Soviet Union -- one can note that in Geneva we came up against two approaches: the old, routine and conservative approach to international policy, and an approach...

[Levin interrupting] Innovative...

[Shishlin] ... essentially an innovative approach. This relates to the problem, say, of regional conflicts. The logic of the United States is as follows: t declares that the events, shall we say, in the Near East, in southern Africa, affect the sphere of U.S. vital interests. The United States is absolutely incapable, at least today, for the time being, of showing understanding of the interests of those states which really exist on this common planet, earth. For the United States, its own national interest, which extends on a global level, is predominant. The new approach and the new philosophy of international relations does not, of course, deny the existence of national interests of the United States, which is indeed a major power with global interests; it calls equally for the national interests of every member of the world community to be taken into account. It demands a great deal of restraint, a great feeling of responsibility, in this difficult, complicated and dramatic nuclear age. The Soviet Union here interprets and understands these regional conflicts not just as conflicts which, shall we say, arose as a result of some conscious or clumsy actions on the part of the Washington administration; it interprets them as the product of the development of the social processes developing on the national soil of these states. The United States, on the other hand, regards these regional conflicts in quite a different way, unfortunately.

Regional Conflicts

[Primakov] Well now, there are various sorts of conflicts. There are indeed regional conflicts or local conflicts which on the whole develop on the basis of the specific socioeconomic features of development of this or that state, and which generally derive from the fact that during the colonial period the states were divided by artificial borders which sometimes cleaved the living body, so to speak, of tribes in Africa, and groups of tribes, and so on. There are conflicts which proceed directly from U.S. policy; for instance, the conflict around Nicaragua. This is a conflict which proceeds directly from U.S. policy. What do the Americans say? One can read this very often in their newspapers. They say that they are against a situation where the governments of one sort or another are imposed from outside. Second, they are against a situation where these governments do not have the support of the people. Third, they are against these governments conducting an aggressive foreign policy. These are the three criteria, so to speak, the three tenets which allegedly define the U.S. position in regard to this or that state. But, there is not the slightest trace of all that where Nicaragua is concerned. It is laughable to suppose that Moscow's hand has manifested itself in the fact that the revolutionary government exists there. This was the most mass revolution, incidentally, in the second half of the 20th century. But, it is laughable to consider that it does not enjoy the support of the people. Elections were held: thousands of observers came, including some from European countries and the United States, people who are far from being enthusiastic about the existing regime. Yet, all of them were convinced that the people were free to express their will. The majority of votes were cast in favor of this regime.

Further, with regard to the aggressive policy, against whom it is directed? Against the United States? When we took part in a get-together there with representatives of the press...

[Shishlin interrupts] I can recall the episode well.

[Primakov] This took place at the center in Geneva.

[Shishlin] I can remember how you answered a question by one of the journalists who said: Would the Soviet Union supply Nicaragua with offensive weapons? Yevgeniy Maksimovich on that occasion said that the Soviet Union is naturally responding to the requests of the Sandinist revolutionary government; which is entitled to lawful defense. But, if the Sandinists intend to commit wide-scale aggression against the United States and to invade the United States [laughter from another speaker], then the Soviet Union will not agree with such a policy and will not give this its support.

[Primakov] And will not supply offensive weapons.

[Levin] I do not think Yevgeniy Maksimovich risked anything here, since the Sandinists do not have any such intention!

[Shishlin] Nevertheless, another argument still exists. After all, there is an armed people in Nicaragua. Why does it need to be armed? It is not using these weapons against the government which in Washington's opinion has been imposed from abroad. It is using them against U.S. aggression and against those forces that are being subsidized, backed, and inspired by the U.S. interventionists.

[Primakov] On the subject of regional conflict, it seems to me that the following feature in the United States' position on this matter should be stressed. Washington views all these regional conflicts in light of confrontation with the Soviet Union. This is Washington's only viewpoint, so to speak, with regard to regional conflicts. This is being manifested in the Near East and with regard to Nicaragua, Afghanistan, and others. It is all only in light of confrontation with the Soviet Union. This means that the causes giving rise to these conflicts are in effect ignored. It is an attempt not to extinguish these conflicts, but an attempt to fit them into U.S. policy aimed against the Soviet Union and to make maximum use of them. Indeed, I will quote the words of Weinberger who said the main task is to prepare and implement harsh confrontation with the Soviet Union on a global and regional level. Those are Weinberger's words.

Soviet, U.S. Responsibility

[Levin] That indeed is the position. This reminds one again of what we have repeatedly been saying, of what the Soviet Union has been saying, about the degree of responsibility now facing literally all states. We really have reached a very dangerous point. If the arms race, which has already assumed gigantic proportions on earth and is putting grave pressure on the whole development of international events, is, moreover, to be transferred into outer space, the course of events may then be more unpredictable, even though there are already elements of unpredictability. It is in these conditions that the posing of the question of responsibility, which is being done by the Soviet Union, is profoundly justified and profoundly well-founded. We are saying that responsibility lies on literally all states, and that all of them should take the most active and direct part in the solving of world problems. Well, a special responsibility lies on the Soviet Union and the United States by virtue of their military, economic, and scientific-technological potential. Indeed, our country is demonstrating an extremely responsible approach to those international problems now confronting mankind. As for the United States, responsibility in this regard is, as yet, insufficient.

[Shishlin] However, we would probably be acting wrongly here, if while we were talking about Geneva we did not in fact touch upon the section in these summit talks dealing with direct Soviet-U.S. bilateral relations. Generally speaking, in this regard success was achieved in solving a number of matters -- indeed, fairly noteworthy issues. This concerned air services between the two countries, agreements on cultural cooperation, and the exchange of consulates. Correspondingly, an additional U.S. consulate is to be opened in Kiev and a Soviet consulate in New York. There is also to be a stepping up of exchanges in the most diverse areas: scientific exchanges and exchanges of students, young people, and artistic groups. These are undoubtedly the positive things that Geneva has brought about. However, I rather think that the main fundamental results of Geneva will manifest themselves in the coming months and in the coming year, 1986, because preparations are already being made for a fresh Soviet-U.S. meeting. The scheduled top-level contacts are of a binding character for both sides.

New Approach To World Affairs

Sometimes this matter appears to me as if some sort of young shoot of some fine plant came into being in Geneva, which in its development is capable of producing very fine fruits. However, by itself, this shoot may develop and produce these fruits only if it has not just one gardener and even not just two gardeners, the Soviet Union and the United States, but if the whole world community will be concerned about the shoot. In this respect, it seems to me that in assessing Geneva and in speaking here about Geneva, we should not forgo the fact that indeed the talks in Geneva were conducted by the leaders of two states, the United States and the Soviet Union; but in effect the whole world was present in Geneva and the demands of the today's world were present, which have really dictated the new philosophy and the new approach to international affairs, which has been so definitively stated by our country's actions, acts, and initiatives.

[Levin] It must be said that the whole world -- I have not seen a single speech by major statesmen and state leaders that has assessed the Geneva meeting negatively -- approves of the Geneva meeting. But the following issue arises: When we speak about the particular responsibility of the Soviet Union and the United States, this is quite fair; but we by no means thereby remove other states' responsibility for the fate of the world.

This week there was a meeting between Thatcher, the British prime minister, and Kohl, the FRG chancellor. One of the subjects of their talks was participation in research work on that same U.S. so-called Strategic Defense Initiative -- that is, the involvement of Britain and the FRG in the SDI. True, some journalists have been expressing the view that while Thatcher supports the program 100 percent, there are some doubts about Chancellor Kohl's position. Well, these doubts may be dictated by domestic political considerations. As far as the Christian Democrats are concerned they are very actively in favor of the SDI.

I think that such actions in present conditions, especially against the background of Geneva, do not promote a development of the Geneva spirit. Such a term has also appeared; but everyone is very well aware that it needs to be filled with material content. I am speaking here of the fact that the development of these beneficial fruits of peace should indeed involve many states, virtually all states; it is necessary that all states approach the adoption of their decisions with particular responsibility and a responsibility that is dictated by the whole international situation now existing in the world. This support for the "star wars" program is a negative thing in the development of international relations and a brake hampering progress; although I repeat that both Thatcher and Kohl assessed highly the results of the Geneva meeting, considering that the meeting was necessary and useful and could produce good results in its development. But everyone's actions must be adequate...

[Primakov interrupts] Geneva is the start of the path, the start of a long and difficult path, along which there will be a struggle against those forces which are attempting to throw the world backwards.

[Levin] The USSR's position was very clearly set out both in the decision of the Politburo and in the resolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The Politburo pointed out that in Soviet-U.S. relations the security sphere, the nucleus of which is the problem of averting the militarization of space and reducing nuclear armaments in an organically interrelated way, will remain the determining factor. The USSR Supreme Soviet stated again that the Soviet Union will continue in the future to firmly and purposefully pursue a principled course which aims to remove the nuclear threat and develop international relations in a spirit of peaceful coexistence and detente. We will continue to proceed along the path upon which our country embarked long before Geneva and during the Geneva meeting, the path of peaceful coexistence between states.

Here we come to the end of our broadcast. Thank you, comrades, for your attention. All the best to you!

PURPOSE OF SPECIAL GATT COMMITTEE DISPUTED

LD291329 Moscow TASS in English 1011 GMT 29 Nov 85

[Text] Geneva, November 29 TASS -- Following four days of intensive discussions the delegates to the 41st annual GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) session have decided to found a special committee that will discuss the aims, subjects and procedural matters of a new round of trade talks between the GATT member-countries with the aim of liberalizing trade.

The developing states, primarily such big countries, as India and Brazil, insisted that the talks should first of all deal with the problems of imbalance in world trade, trade restrictions and intensifying protectionist practices in the United States and other Western nations -- the factors which cause serious damage to the economies of the countries following the path of independent development.

In contrast, the United States and the Western countries backing it assigned priority to the issue of lifting restrictions on the sphere of services (banking and insurance, mediation, etc.), since two-thirds of the United States' economic activity lie exactly in that sphere. The U.S. brought strong pressure to bear on the delegates, sometimes resorting to overt blackmail. For example, Washington said that it would open bilateral contacts with individual countries if the question of services and trade in high-tech goods was not included into the agenda of the proposed talks.

India, Brazil and other developing states expressed the view that these attempts of the U.S. were dictated by the desire to undermine their status in world trade and give American and transnational monopolies dominating positions in the sphere of services. Washington's actions were also explained by the intention to solve at others' expense the problem of its huge trade deficit which, according to forecasts, may reach about 150 billion dollars this year.

After heated debates it was decided not to mention the question of including the problem of liberalizing services into the agenda of the special committee's work. However, U.S. representatives stated their firm determination to press for the discussion of that disputed issue by the committee. The special committee is to submit a report to the GATT session next September.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR BETTER RELATIONS LIES WITH U.S.

PM301936 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 Nov 85 First Edition p 3

[Ernst Genri article under the rubric "Arguments and Facts": "After Geneva: The Power of Consensus"]

[Text] Can Soviet-U.S. relations really improve? Some people in the West would certainly answer this question in the negative. How can the USSR and the United States, they would say, after everything that has happened between them since the fifties, establish and ensure really strong and peace-loving relations with one another? In their opinion, only idealists can believe this.

Is that true?

Let us look first at the problems of international security. Is it not clear to any realist that no other event in the world arena could strengthen peace as much as the establishment of strong Soviet-U.S. relations? That is indisputable.

The most terrible prospect -- a clash between the two main powers in the world -- would be eliminated. But, let us go further. Suppose a threat to peace began to emanate from some other, third, power. Who would dare embark on such a path if the USSR and the United States were standing together in the way?

If Moscow and Washington, hand in hand, firmly seek peace, the cause of peace is invincible. Then the other problems of international security will, sooner or later, be normalized [voyti v normu].

Answering questions at his 21 November press conference in Geneva, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said:

"Nevertheless, I look to the future with optimism. If we all continue to act in the spirit of responsibility both in Soviet-U.S. relations and in international relations as as a whole, the spirit that was felt at the Geneva meeting, we will find answers to the most burning problems and approaches toward their solution. I am profoundly convinced of this."

We will find answers...

Reactionary skeptics in the United States will possibly say: It is difficult to imagine any head of the White House taking a favorable view of joint actions with the USSR. But are they correct?

It is true that President Harry Truman, for example, treated the Land of the Soviets with open hostility and that the "cold war" began with him. Presidents Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, and some others were also far from friends of the Soviet State. There is no room for argument here.

But why should not some U.S. president, sooner or later, take the path that was taken by Franklin Roosevelt in his time? It was, after all, Roosevelt who told his compatriots in a radio address in April 1942, during the most difficult period of World War II: "The United States pays tribute to the crushing counteroffensive by the great Russian Armies against the powerful German Army. The Russian forces have destroyed and are destroying more of our enemies' armed forces -- soldiers, aircraft, tanks, and guns -- than all the rest of the United Nations together.

Roosevelt did not stop there. Departing from the Crimea conference of the USSR, the United States, and Britain in February 1945, he wrote to I.V. Stalin: "I am convinced that the peoples of the world will look at the achievement of this conference not only with approval, but also as a real guarantee that our three great nations can cooperate in peace as effectively as in war."

Roosevelt died before he could realize his hope of strengthening postwar international security jointly with the USSR. He was one of the most popular U.S. presidents. As an exception, he was elected to the White House for four consecutive terms. Why should he not have disciples in our time?

The United States had disputes with the Soviet Union on various current issues even under him. This is natural. But, even so, amicable businesslike contacts were maintained and it was this, without any doubt, that helped save the world from the fascist plague in the forties. The danger that threatens mankind today is no less terrifying.

Jefferson, author of the famous U.S. Declaration of Independence, declared in his time: "If there is one single principle which must be implanted in the mind of Americans deeper than any other, it is that we must have nothing to do with conquerors." He also expressed the program of U.S. foreign policy in the following words: "peace, trade, and friendship with everyone; alliances (in other words, the military blocs of that time -- e.g.) with no one."

For his part, George Washington warned the Americans in his farewell adress to the nation against entering into military alliances with foreign powers, in other words against creating aggressive blocs.

Should Washington and Jefferson really be considered old-fashioned politicians now in comparison with Pentagon figures? They did not have modern armies, but they were really wise and farsighted statesmen. And after all, real political farsightedness is always more important than armies.

Are there deep social and ideological differences between the two opposing social systems? Yes, there are. But does this rule out peaceful relations between them? Clearly not.

The draft new edition of the CPSU Program says: "The CPSU proceeds on the basis that the historical dispute between the two opposing social systems into which the modern world is divided can and must be resolved peacefully. Socialism proves its advantages not by force of arms, but by the force of its example in all spheres of social life..." It also stresses: The CPSU "considers the extension of the ideological differences between the two systems to the sphere of these relations to be impermissible."

We can and should argue. But do ideological disputes really hinder the joint struggle for security?

In February 1920 (Karl Biggand), a correspondent for the U.S. UNIVERSAL SERVICE news agency, asked V.I. Lenin the questions: What is the basis for peace between the Soviet republic and the United States? Lenin replied: "Let the U.S. capitalists leave us alone. We will not touch them."

These words of the founder of the Soviet State remain in force to this day. Moscow believes that all peoples must resolve their affairs themselves without interfering in the internal affairs of others either in politics or in economics.

The economic aspect of cooperation between the USSR and the United States is, of course, exceptionally important. What does this aspect of the problem show? A great deal.

Given complete normalization of political relations between the two powers there is nothing improbable and fantastic in the assumption that their foreign trade transactions could with time increase several times over, becoming a very important factor in the two countries' economic lives. Who does not know that the Soviet Union has gigantic untapped economic potential? And who does not know that the United States requires new markets and new sources of raw materials? Economics here is closely interwoven with politics.

Would Americans -- all ordinary Americans -- really be unhappy if the present colossal military budget, which exceeds $300 billion, were lifted from their shoulders? Who among them does not feel the financial pinch of that? Who does not want considerable tax cuts?

This, in all probability, would be one of the first measures after the curtailment of the arms race as a result of agreements with the USSR. The expansion of foreign trade, the reduction of military spending, and tax cuts -- all this would certainly reduce the threat of a severe economic crisis for Americans. Thanks to this people would breathe freely.

Is it necessary to prove what expanded and deepened Soviet-U.S. Cooperation in the field of science could do for the entire world, not just the USSR and the United States? Scientists in both countries have repeatedly shown how successfully they can cooperate with each other even during confrontation between their states. It is by no means out of the question that under conditions of lasting, guaranteed, and prolonged peace this cooperation could raise modern civilization to new heights.

Those are the prospects in the event of an improvement in soviet-U.S. relations. It is not necessary to recall what the prospects would be like in the event of a deterioration in those relations. It is necessary to choose. The USSR, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in his report at the USSR Supreme Soviet session, "feels no enmity toward the United States and respects the U.S. people. We do not base our policy on the desire to infringe U.S. national interests." The Soviet Union has already taken the initiative in reaching agreement [soglasiye]. The ball is in the transatlantic politicians' court.

SUMMIT CONTINUES TO EXERT FAVORABLE IMPACT

PM 291601 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Nov 85 First Edition p 4

[G. Vasilyev dispatch: "America After Geneva"]

[Text] New York, 28 Nov -- What do Americans think about the Geneva summit meeting? In order to find out the opinion of the "man in the street" I set off for downtown Manhattan, for the corner of 50th Street and 6th Avenue. There are always people here and one can talk with those who are called "ordinary Americans."

Kevin Sairac, a teacher from the state of New Jersey, said: "It's good that the meeting took place and that they managed to discuss the most important international problems. The threat of a nuclear war deeply troubles both adult Americans and students with whom I work. That is why everything done to reduce this threat can only be welcomed."

"I know," Sairac continued, "that differences appeared at the negotiations regarding the limitng of the arms race. But I also know that an agreement was reached to continue and activate Soviet-U.S. negotiations on these problems. This is very important."

Carpenter Willy Hunt: "I'm not very clear on the details of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting."

But I have heard that they agreed there on future exchanges of visits. This is good. This will help to improve our relations."

That day I spoke with many Americans at the crowded intersection of 50th Street and 6th Avenue: with a professor of anthropology, a bank employee, a teamster, an artist, a surgeon, and a refuse collector. Unfeigned satisfaction was apparent in their replies. I came across only one skeptic who said the Geneva meeting will change nothing and that everything, according to him, will carry on as before. The rest, in different words but basically unanimously, approved of the results of the summit meeting and expressed the hope that it would serve as a good beginning on the path of improving Soviet-U.S. relations and the international situation.

Our "public opinion poll" showed that, deep down, the "ordinary American" has not accepted the position of the "hawks," who have stubbornly attempted to persuade him in recent years that the atmosphere of enmity and tension between the United States and the USSR is the "natural condition" for two countries belonging to opposite socioeconomic systems. It showed he is tired of this enmity, is worried by its possible catastrophic consequences, and would like to believe that changes for the better have appeared. And -- what is particularly significant -- he considers the most important task to be that of curbing the arms race and reducing the nuclear threat.

Political sensations in the United States are short-lived. Splashed all over the front pages of today's newspapers, tomorrow they will sink in the abyss of fast-flowing life. Such is the general law. But Geneva broke this law -- the news from there has firmly kept the lead in television broadcasts, radio reports, and press material. The huge interest in the first meeting between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States in the last 6 and 1/2 years, coupled with an awareness of the vital importance of those tasks which history itself has set our countries, placed the Geneva meeting in the forefront of political and social life.

It seems that U.S. attitudes were well expressed by member of Congress Barbara Boxer from California: "Today I and my fellow citizens felt better. We have expended a great deal of effort in our district to carry through a resolution in California on a nuclear weapons freeze. At least we now know that contacts between our two countries have begun to be restored."

Although the Geneva meeting was not able to slow the pace of the Arms buildup, THE WASHINGTON POST writes, "nevertheless it has altered the climate and improved relations between the two countries, which in the future could lead to a broad improvement in relations between two leading countries of the world."

One can boldly say that in the opinion of the majority of U.S. observers, Geneva has laid good foundations for the process of improving Soviet-U.S. relations and lessening international tension. While stating that the meeting did not succeed in resolving the specific issues of arms limitation and reduction, at the same time they note that the Soviet-U.S. accord reached in January 1985 on the necessity to seek ways of preventing an arms race in outer space and halting the arms race on earth was confirmed. They also note that the joint statement contained in the final document on the inadmissibility of a nuclear war, on the fact that there would be no victors in this war, and on the sides' renunciation of attempts to achieve military superiority is of great significance. Many admit that the main obstacle on the path to the curbing of the arms race in all its forms is SDI -- Washington's "star wars" program.

Of course, all this does not mean there is nobody in the United States today who is dissatisfied with the Geneva results.

On the very evening President Reagan addressed a joint session of the two houses of Congress and spoke of the results of his Geneva negotiations as a "new beginning" in Soviet-U.S. relations, in the capital's Hyatt Regency Hotel like-minded people, primarily people of an extremely right-wing persuasion, were gathering to honor Senator Jesse Helms, one of the most frenzied "hawks." The atmosphere in the hotel ballroom, as journalists immediately observed, was very different from that which predominated that evening in the Capitol building. When the U.S. President said certain progress had been achieved at the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva concerning a reduction in nuclear tension, applause rang out through the Capitol building. But at the gathering of ultra-right-wingers, whose participants were following what was happening in the Capitol on television, a deathly silence reigned at this moment. The goal of those gathered at the banquet of the "hawks" was voiced by a representative of the ultra-right-wing army, Mr. Howard Phillips. The Geneva meeting, he said, "is creating an environment which could make the arms buildup more difficult." The very first days after Geneva attest that the forces of the military-industrial complex and political reaction would like to emasculate the meaning of the Geneva decisions and do everything possible to prevent progress toward the achievement of accords on the main issues of war and peace and curbing the deadly dangerous race toward the nuclear abyss.

In order to correctly understand the impact of Geneva on the social and political climate in the United States one has to remember that the summit meeting was preceded by a very difficult period in Soviet-U.S. relations. For at least 5 years a cosmic coldness has built up in relations. Fanatical anticommunism, the gamble on force in international affairs, and the arms buildup as a guarantee of "defending America's national interests," have almost become the norms of official political thinking. The summit meeting, to use the graphic expression of the leaders of the Communist Party of the United States, Henry Winston and Gus Hall, has cracked the ice of the "cold war." This, in the opinion of many commentators here, creates more favorable conditions for those forces in the United States and abroad which are concerned for the fate of the world and which strive for changes for the better in international affairs.

The summit meeting has noticeably increased the public's interest in the problems of Soviet-U.S. relations and has activated discussion of the question of the basis on which these relations must be built. For several days now, often stretching beyond midnight, lively discussions on this subject have been held on television with the participation of well-known political and public figures and journalists, and also linking up with Soviet experts via "space bridge." The program "Nightline," on the ABC channel, comes to mind. One of its participants began to develop the idea on this program that Americans supposedly have a certain "technological edge" on the Soviet Union and that this "edge" must be increased in order to gain a position of military superiority. Refutation of the arguments of the apologist or the "position of strength policy" came from a man who could not possibly be suspected of pro-Soviet sympathies. Robert McNamara, former U.S. secretary of defense, convincingly showed that however many times the United States has tried to forge ahead in the military sphere -- first by creating the atom bomb, then the hydrogen bomb, then arming itself with ICBM's, and then with MIRV's -- the Soviet Union has quickly restored strategic parity each time. So it will be in the future too if the United States persists with its "star wars" plans, McNamara argued. Look back and draw conclusions from the lessons of history, urged the former leader of the Pentagon.

Now one also cannot fail to observe something else. As if at the wave of a baton by an invisible conductor, the U.S. mass media have now begun to curtail discussion of the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. Someone is clearly trying to localize the effect of Geneva, slow down that positive process, and weaken the powerful impetus given this process by the summit meeting. But despite these efforts, the salutary effect of the Geneva meeting is continuing.

The hopes it kindled in people's hearts, the ideas it placed at the center of the political debates, and the accords published cannot be simply relegated to a page of history that has already been turned. The "Summit," as the Soviet-U.S. top-level meeting is called here for short, having shown everyone that strong sense of responsibility for the fate of mankind with which the Soviet Union forms its policies, continues to work in favor of mutual understanding, in favor of improving the international situation, and in favor of peace.

U.S. LEADS TECHNOLOGY BLOCKADE IN 'ECONOMIC WAR'

LD292136 Moscow TASS in English 2101 GMT 29 Nov 85

[Text] Moscow, November 29 TASS -- An economic war against the USSR is a major component of the "crusade" against communism, the weekly NEW TIMES says in its latest issue. The USA would like economically to exhaust the Soviet Union by imposing on it another round of the arms race. One of the purposes of the "star wars" program is to make the USSR spend billions for non-productive purposes and divert material and intellectual resources from the goals of economic and social development.

History, however, bears witness to the absolute futility of Washington's hopes to bleed the Soviet Union white economically by a technological blockade. The USSR has long become a great scientific and technical power and achieved full technological self-sufficiency. The USSR orients more than any other industrialized country in the world to its own scientific and technical achievements and uses what foreign science and technology have to offer on an incomparably smaller scale than the USA, Japan or West European countries do.

In view of all this, the claims of "hawks" on the other side of the ocean that purchases of advanced technology and know-how have helped to bolster considerably the Soviet military and economic potential sound ridiculous. Knowledgeable Western specialists are well aware that the Soviet defense industry relies exclusively on the domestic scientific, technological and production potential. We cannot allow even a minimum dependence on Western technology in this field for quite obvious reasons.

At the same time, the weekly stresses, we would not like to refuse the advantage offered by technological exchanges with Western countries. But these exchanges should be based exclusively on mutual benefit. The USSR and other socialist countries would not be talked to in the language of technological diktat. And those Western countries which, yielding to the pressure and blackmail of "hawks" on the other side of the ocean, introduce restrictions on trade with us should carefully think over the possible consequences of this foreign economic policy, the weekly stresses.

U.S. INCREASES NAVAL PRESENCE IN MEDITERRANEAN

LD020614 Moscow TASS in English 0606 GMT 2 Dec 85

[Text] Tripoli, December 2 TASS -- The United States has increased its naval presence in the Mediterranean, JANA news agency reported. According to confirmed data, it said, aircraft-carriers, transports and other U.S. naval ships have been brought up to Crete Island.

PRC FOREIGN MINISTRY DELEGATION VISITS KIEV

AU271047 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 20 Nov 85 p 3

[RATAU report: "Guests to Kiev"]

[Text] On 18-19 November a PRC Foreign Ministry delegation headed by Tian Ding Consular Department chief, visited the Ukraine's capital city. It was received by V.N. Lipatov, Ukrainian deputy minister of foreign affairs. The Ukrainian Ministry of Foreign Affairs gave a dinner in honor of the Chinese diplomats.

In the Ukrainian Society for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries the guests had a conversation with V.P. Osnach, chairman of the society's board of the Ukrainian branch of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society.

The delegation members inspected the exhibition of the Ukrainian State Museum of the Great Patriotic War 1941-45 memorial complex, and made a trip to the Vasilyev Sovkhoz in Vyshgorodskiy Rayon, Kiev Oblast.

IL-85 AIRCRAFT ON DEMONSTRATION FLIGHTS IN PRC

PM290936 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 8

[TASS report: "China: Il-86 Flights"]

[Text] Beijing, 27 Nov -- A Soviet IL-86 wide-bodied passenger aircraft has arrived here for demonstration flights. A Soviet delegation headed by Chief Designer Academician G.V. Novozhilov arrived on the aircraft. During the first demonstration flight above the Chinese capital, the aircraft carried Hu Yizhou, director general of the China Civil Aviation General Administration; representatives of the PRC ministries of Foreign Affairs, Foreign Economic Relations and Trade, and Aeronautics, and other departments; and Chinese journalists.

The Il-86 will carry out demonstration flights in other Chinese cities -- Canton, Shanghai, and Harbin. The relevant accord was reached by the "Aviaeksport" All-Union Association and the China National Machinery and Equipment Import and Export Corporation and the China Civil Aviation General Administration.

ASPAT-85 ENDS IN BEIJING; TALKS HELD WITH PRC

LD302031 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1700 GMT 30 Nov 85

[Text] Beijing, 30 Nov (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Grigoriy Arslanov reports:

ASPAT-85, the international fair of Asian and Pacific Basin countries, closed here today. Taking part were 21 countries of the region including the USSR, as well as the GDR, Sweden, Finland, the FRG and the Netherlands.

The Soviet Pavilion proved very successful with visitors to the fair. During the 16 days it ran it was visited by about 800,000 people. The exhibits in the pavilion told of the achievements of the Soviet people in various spheres of the economy and in science and technology. The exhibits on display included, in particular, laser instruments, textile equipment, models of aviation equipment, motorcars and goods vehicles and various publications.

While the fair was in progress, useful talks on questions related to a further development of trade and economic ties between the two countries were held between representatives of Soviet and Chinese foreign-trade organizations.

CINEMATOGRAPHY DELEGATION HOLDS TALKS IN BEIJING

PM261229 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report under general headline "Delegation's Visit"]

[Text] Beijing, 24 Nov -- Seypidin, vice chairman of the National People's Congress Standing Committee, received today [24 Nov] a delegation of figures from Soviet filmmaking headed by F. T. Yermash, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Cinematography. Seypidin observed that Soviet Filmmaking exerted a great influence on the formation and development of Chinese cinema. The expansion of cultural cooperation, he said, will promote mutual understanding between the two peoples and countries. Their conversation stressed the great importance of establishing cooperation between the two countries not only in the cinematic sphere but also television, as well as in exchanges of trainees and delegations of specialists in the cinematic sphere. Ding Qiao, PRC vice minister of culture, and I.S. Shcherbakov, USSR ambassador to the PRC, took part in the conversation.

WRITERS, WOMEN'S, CULTURAL DELEGATIONS VISIT PRC

OW010256 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1600 GMT 29 Nov 85

[Text] The activists of the central board of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society met with some of the members of the Soviet delegations which recently returned from visits to China, at an evening party held at the House for Friendship With Peoples of Foreign Countries in Moscow on 29 November.
(Miharkov), head of the Soviet writers delegation and noted Soviet writer, (Milovichkaya), member of the Soviet women's delegation and academician of the Far Eastern Scientific Center of the USSR Academy of Science and (Zhikalenko), activist of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries and the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society, deputy head of the Soviet Touring Group and Chairman of the Far Eastern Scientific Center of the Academy of Sciences talked about their impressions of their China visits. They recalled the hospitality accorded them in China. They spoke highly of the Chinese people's achievements in economic and cultural development, and the Chinese people's friendly sentiments toward the Soviet people. Those who spoke at the evening party hoped for expanded exchanges between the various social and literary organizations of the two countries. They maintained that such exchanges will be beneficial to strengthening bilateral friendship.

CHINESE WRITERS DELEGATION VISIT REPORTED

Soviet Literature Praised

OW301305 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0700 GMT 29 Nov 85

[Text] A Chinese writers delegation is visiting our country. Soviet writers including Markov, first secretary of the USSR Union of Writers, met and held conversations with Chinese writers. Shao Hua, head of the Chinese writers delegation, spoke at the meeting.
[Begin Shao recording] We are honored and happy to be received by the USSR Union of Writers headed by Markov during our tour of the USSR. Soviet literature has a great impact on China. Not only has it influenced our writers but also the vast masses of people. During the war years, many Soviet works including [names indistinct] were in the field packs of our fighters. Soviet literary works encourage us to fight. Therefore, writers of the two nations share common sentiments, the literary courses of the two nations are similar, and both of us share a common language in many areas. I believe that our visit will be a success. [end recording]

Visits Leningrad

OW271144 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1600 GMT 26 Nov 85

[Excerpts] The Chinese writers delegation is continuing its tour of the Soviet Union. The delegation consists of leader Shao Hua and members (Wei Guowen), (Wu Yaoyi), and (Xie Yongwang). During their stay in Leningrad, the Chinese guests visited the Lenin Memorial Hall in the Smolnyy Palace and laid a wreath at the monument to the defenders of Leningrad during the great war of national defense. The Chinese writers attended a forum at the Mayakovskiy Writers Hall with writers of Leningrad.

In his welcoming address, (Shitolov), first secretary of the Leningrad Writers Association, said: [Begin recording in Russian fading into Mandarin translation by announcer] We are very delighted at our meeting after a long period of silence. We have had interesting conversations in a very friendly atmosphere. [end recording]

Also speaking at the forum was (Eyks), writer, historian, and curator of the Museum of Native Arts. He said: [begin recording in Russian fading into Mandarin translation by announcer] Over 40,000 Chinese art objects are displayed in our museum. During the 900-day siege of Leningrad, the museum staff did their utmost to protect these priceless treasures. [end recording]

The Chinese writers also visited the No 5 Leningrad Technical School where Chinese language courses are offered to the students. The students staged literary and art performance for the guests. The Chinese delegation visited all the major museums in Leningrad and toured Pushkin City, where the great Russian poet spent his childhood.

In an interview with a station reporter at the end of the visit, Shao Hua, head of the Chinese writers delegation, said: [begin recording]= This is our first visit to Leningrad. In our discussions with writers of Leningrad concerning literature, we discovered that we share a common language in many aspects. We agreed that our literature serves the people and socialism and that we follow the principles of realism in writing creative works. I think it is very important that our literature inspires and educates people.

We were most impressed by two things. First, we viewed the exhibit showing the entire battle to protect Leningrad during the 900-day siege. We were touched during our visit to Petrograd Cemetery. These places reminded us of the past years of struggle. Here, I would like to pay tribute to the heroic city of Leningrad. Its people are invincible.

Second, we were most impressed by the museums we visited. We were greatly inspired by the art treasures displayed in the museums. Leningrad is a city of arts. Our visit to Leningrad has been like a swim in the ocean of arts.

The Leningrad Writers Association has carefully planned our schedule. We are very pleased. The hospitality is not only for the Chinese writers, it is also a friendly gesture for all Chinese people. [end recording]

After winding up its visit to Leningrad, the Chinese writers delegation arrived in Tbilisi, the capital of the Georgia SSR.

Tours Georgian Republic

LD272016 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 27 Nov 85

[Text] Here is a report from Tbilisi. Chinese and Georgian masters of the written word have met in the Union of Writers of Georgia. A delegation headed by well-known prose writer (Xiao Hua), secretary of the Chinese Writers Association Board, which has arrived from Moscow, continues to get acquainted with our country. The guests talked about Chinese readers' growing interest in Soviet literature. The mutual striving for the expansion of creative contacts was expressed at the meeting. During their 5-day stay in Georgia, the Chinese writers will get acquainted with the republic's literary and public life, will visit towns, rayons, enterprises, kolkhozes, and educational establishments.

LITERATURNAYA GAZETA ON LIFE, CHANGES IN CHINA

PM281455 [Editorial Report] Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 20 November 1985 carries on page 14 a 5,500-word article by Sergey Merinov under the heading "China Today: A Time of Change," describing the author's visit to the PRC with a group of activists from the Union of Soviet Friendship Societies and the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society, Sinologists, and representatives of the Soviet Committee for Solidarity with Asian and African Countries and the USSR Journalists Union, on the occasion of the celebrations of the "40th Anniversary of the Routing of Militarist Japan and the End of World War II in the Far East." Merinov describes visits to the Great Wall and other sights, giving his impressions of tourism in China today and giving a background outline of the history of the cultural revolution and subsequent developments. He portrays everyday life in China, where prosperity is increasing, and describes what he did and saw in Beijing and Harbin, focusing on the changes which have taken place in recent years. Finally he notes: "We were reminded of the past many times, but only as the past. In the present, Soviet-Chinese relations have to take account above all of present-day political realities, disregarding the events of many years. As is known, the foundations have already been laid. Trade is growing, agreements have been concluded on the construction and modernization of a number of Chinese enterprises, and scientific, technical, cultural, and sporting exchanges are growing. Parliamentary contacts have resumed. Political consultations take place in Moscow and Beijing by turn. An important meeting took place in New York recently between Foreign Ministers E.A. Shevardnadze and Wu Xueqian. The sides exchanged briefings on the course of socialist building in the Soviet Union and China and came out in favor of the gradual widening of bilateral ties and contacts in various avenues, including the continuation of political dialogue." He notes in conclusion that many people they spoke to in China spoke of the "desire to develop relations with the USSR," and that the potential exists for this.

FRG BUNDESTAG DELEGATION VISITS LENINGRAD

LD030303 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2220 GMT 2 Dec 85

[Text] An FRG Bundestag delegation headed by its president, Jenninger, has completed a 2-day visit to Leningrad. The guests are in the Soviet Union on an official visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The parliamentarians were received at the Leningrad Gorispolkom.

TOLKUNOV, CONFERS WITH FRG AMBASSADOR 29 NOV

PM021350 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general headline "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 29 November L.N. Tolkunov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the Union, received J. Kastl, FRG ambassador to the USSR, at the latter's request. During their conversation they examined questions of further developing parliamentary ties between the USSR and the FRG.

DEPUTY PREMIER ANTONOV RECEIVES FRG BUSINESSMAN

PM021313 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the "Official Reports" headline]

[Text] A.K. Antonov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, has received H. Duerr, chairman of the board of the West German Company AEG-Telefunken, at his request. J. Kastl, FRG ambassador to the USSR, took part in the conversation.

SWEDISH COMMUNIST WORKERS PARTY GROUP VISITS

PM021107 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Dec 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Interparty Ties"]

[Text] In accordance with the plan for ties between the CPSU and the Communist Workers Pary [APK] a delegation of APK party workers headed by I. Loov, member of the party board executive committee, was in the Soviet Union 23-30 November. The Swedish comrades had meetings and talks at the CPSU Central Committee International Section, the CPSU Central Committee Social Sciences Institute, the AUCCTU, and the EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA editorial board. The delegation also made a trip to Orel, where it was received at the CPSU Obkom and familiarized itself with the work of the party and trade union organizations at industrial enterprises and with Soviet people's life and work.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS, RELATIONS WITH TURKEY EXAMINED

NC020956 Istanbul CUMHURIYET in Turkish 27 Nov 85 pp 1, 10

[Report by Ergun Balci]

[Text] Moscow -- The Soviet Union will consider the proposal by NATO Commander in Chief Bernard Rogers to arm the 72 F-16's slated for deployment in Turkey with nuclear warheads capable of hitting the Soviet Union as a serious threat. We asked Colonel Geliy Batenin, deputy director of the Disarmament Department in the Office of the Chief of the General Staff, to comment on this proposal which General Rogers put forward in October. The colonel said: "This constitutes a new nuclear threat to the Soviet Union. Such a situation may upset the balance between the southern region of the Soviet Union and the southeastern flank of NATO. The F-16 is an extremely modern aircraft which can carry four nuclear bombs. Therefore, we must take this development into consideration."

Col Batenin also noted that fitting F-16's with nuclear warheads would have a negative effect from a political point of view. The Soviet Union has supported the creation of a nuclear free zone in the Balkans, he added, and Gen Rogers' proposal will run counter to this. The idea of creating a nuclear free zone in the Balkans belongs to Greek Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou.

We then reminded Col Batenin that there are already certain U.S. nuclear weapons in Turkey and the Rogers' proposal would not mean their deployment there for the first time. He replied: "That is true. There are U.S. nuclear weapons in Turkey. Turkey has permitted their deployment. This is Turkey's problem. However, equipping the F-16's with nuclear warheads will be a very important and very serious development. The Soviet Union must take this into account."

The Soviet authorities have also expressed their annoyance at the airfields being built in Erzurum and Mus. Niko Kinayeve, the Foreign Ministry secretary general responsible for the Turkey desk, has stated that the airfields being constructed in Mus and Erzurum "do not augur well for peace." Kinayev made this remark after we informed him that these airfields were being built within the NATO framework and for NATO purposes. Asked why the Soviet Union felt annoyed, he said: "Depots are being built at these airfields. These are not conducive to peace."

We asked Kinayev whether the Soviet Union feared that these airfields would be used by the Rapid Deployment Force in the future, and he replied: "Turkey has given us assurance in this respect. However, this issue has another aspect with which the Turkish public should be familiar. In the past the United States has sometimes used its bases in other countries to intervene in the internal affairs of non-NATO members without prior permission. We wish to draw Turkey's attention to this point. Turkey is a NATO country; but it is not just any NATO country. It is located right on our borders. Turkey occupies an important place in U.S.-Soviet policy. If Turkey allows the United States to use its territory for aggression against the Soviet Union, then this will not be a good thing."

Kinayev also noted that the Soviet Union is in favor of maintaining good relations with Turkey even if stays in NATO. He said: "We know quite well that there are military blocs, and we know that it is not easy to abandon these blocks. The Soviet Union's good-neighbor policy is long-term and unchanging. This principle was emphasized at the 26th CPSU Congress. We favor high-level contacts with Turkey. Former Prime Minister Tikhonov's visit was implemented within this framework.

A natural gas project will be realized between our two countries, and relations in the fields of art and trade are also developing. We wish to see such relations developed further."

PRESIDIUM, MINISTERS HAIL TURKISH NATIONAL DAY

PM020951 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Exchange of Telegrams"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has sent a message to Turkish President Kenan Evren marking the country's national holiday -- the 62d anniversary of the proclamation of Turkish independence -- and conveyed congratulations and best wishes to him and the Turkish people. In his reply message, K. Evren expressed gratitude for the congratulations and for his part wished the peoples of the Soviet Union prosperity. The messages express the hope that USSR-Turkish relations will continue to develop on the basis of good-neighborliness and mutual benefit in the interests of the peoples of both countries and in the interests of strengthening peace.

The USSR Council of Ministers also sent a message to Turkish Prime Minister Turgut Ozal conveying congratulations and good wishes to him on the 62d anniversary of the proclamation of Turkish independence. In his reply message, T. Ozal expressed gratitude for the congratulations. The messages express the hope that multifaceted, mutually beneficial USSR-Turkish cooperation will develop further for the good of the peoples of both their countries and world peace.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON MUGABE VISIT TO MOSCOW

PRAVDA Report

PM021027 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 85 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report under the rubric "On a Visit to the Soviet Union": "Robert Garbriel Mugabe, President and First Secretary of the Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front Party and Prime Minister of the Republic of Zimbabwe"]

[Excerpts] Robert Gabriel Mugabe, president and first secretary of the Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front (ZANU-PF) party and prime minister of Zimbabwe, arrives in Moscow today for an official visit as head of a party and govenment delegation, at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers.

After the general election held in 1980, R. Mugabe was appointed prime minister and formed the first government of the independent Republic of Zimbabwe. Since 1984 R. Mugabe has been president and first secretary of the ZANU-PF party. He also holds the post of defense minister and is commander in chief of the Zimbabwean Armed Forces.

The party headed by R. Mugabe pursues a course of progressive political and socio-economic transformations with the aim of building, in the future, a society free from the exploitation of man by man.

Zimbabwe, adhering to a policy of nonalignment, comes out actively within the United Nations and the OAU and at other international forums against imperialism's aggressive actions, for the strengthening of peace and the people's security, and for the complete eradication of colonialism, racism, and apartheid.

Soviet people cordially welcome the arrival of the USSR of Robert Gabriel Mugabe, president and first secretary of the ZANU-PF party and prime minister of Zimbabwe, and express confidence that his official visit to our country will be an important milestone along the parth of strengthening the friendship and fruitful cooperation between the CPSU and ZANU-PF, the Soviet Union and Zimbabwe, and the Soviet and Zimbabwean peoples.

Talks With Ryzhkov

LD021813 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 2 Dec 85

[Text] Talks between Comrade Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Mugabe, president and first secretary of the Central Committee of the Zimbabwe African National Union - Patriotic Front party [ZANU-PF] and prime minister of the Republic of Zimbabwe, took place in the Kremlin today.

During the talks Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov informed Robert Mugabe of the achievements of the Soviet people in various spheres of socialist construction, of the USSR's implementation of plans for the all-round improvement of socialism, of preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress and the nationwide discussion of pre-congress documents.

For his part Robert Mugabe told of the work carried out in Zimbabwe on the implementation of the decisions of the second congress of the ZANU-PF, which set the task of the progressive development of Zimbabwean society in the direction of socialism.

He assessed highly the peace-loving foreign policy of the Soviet Union and its efforts aimed at strengthening international peace and security, in support of countries and peoples fighting for their national liberation and social progress.

During the exchange of views that took place questions of Soviet-Zimbabwean relations were discussed. Noting that there are favorable possibilities for the development of broad friendly cooperation in various spheres, the sides exchanged views on joint steps, which will be taken in the near future to these ends. An understanding was reached on signing an intergovernmental agreement on economic and technological cooperation between the USSR and the Republic of Zimbabwe.

Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov and Robert Mugabe noted the great significance of the strengthening of cooperation of all progressive and peace-loving forces in the struggle for the consolidation of international security, the guaranteeing of the rights of peoples to independence and social progress. The sides stressed that an important role in this struggle is played by the Nonaligned Movement, whose summit conference is to be held in Harare, capital of Zimbabwe, in 1986.

Particular attention was paid to the situation in Southern Africa, where the racist RSA regime, trying to prevent the inevitable crash of the inhuman apartheid system, is carrying out mass-scale repression against the population, is engaging in subversive activity, is carrying out acts of direct aggression with respect to Angola and other frontline states, is trying to foist upon them its diktat and turn them from the path they have chosen.

Pretoria's policy was resolutely condemned and the conviction was expressed that the so-called constructive cooperation with the RSA being carried out by the U. S. Administration is the main obstacle to the adoption by the international community of effective measures to curb the racists. The Soviet Union and Zimbabwe reaffirm their support for demands for the adoption of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against the RSA in line with Chapter 7 of the UN Charter.

The talks passed off in a friendly atmosphere and in a spirit of mutual understanding.

Taking part in the talks on the Soviet side were: Comrade Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister; Comrade Ponomarev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and CPSU Central Committee secretary; Foreign Trade Minister Comrade Aristov; Comrade Katushev, chairman of the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations; Marshal of the Soviet Union Akhromeyev, USSR first deputy defense minister; USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Comrade Ilyichev; Comrade Ter-Gazaryants, ambassador of the USSR to the Republic of Zimbabwe.

The members of the party-government delegation who arrived with Robert Mugabe also took part in the talks.

Meets Gromyko

LD021913 Moscow TASS in English 1856 GMT 2 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 2 TASS -- Andrey Gromyko, a member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU, president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R., had a meeting with Robert Mugabe, president and first secretary of the Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front (ZANU-PF) party, prime minister of the Republic of Zimbabwe, and the persons accompanying him in the Kremlin today.

The prime minister's attention has been attracted to the results of the meeting held in Geneva between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and President Reagan of the USA, and the corresponding decisions taken by the USSR Supreme Soviet on the results of that meeting. The supreme body of state power of the USSR has said that the Land of the Soviets will further purposefully pursue the principled policy of eliminating the nuclear threat, of developing international relations in the spirit of peaceful coexistence and detente.

The American side at Geneva proved to be not prepared for major decisions concerning nuclear weapons and averting the militarization of outer space. Nevertheless, the long-term significance of the meeting is great. This should manifest itself in the specific practical deeds in the visible period and will depend on the readiness of both sides to act on the basis of the joint statement adopted at Geneva. There is no dearth of wish on the part of the Soviet Union to uphold the cause of peace. Peoples expect actions in the same direction from the American side too.

Robert Mugabe has highly evaluated the Soviet Union's consistent peaceful foreign policy, its peaceful proposals directed at curbing the arms race, at disarmament, strengthening peace, support for the countries and peoples fighting for national liberation and social progress.

Attention has been devoted during the meeting to the situation in the south African region, where the racist Pretoria regime is pursuing a policy of state terrorism vis-a-vis the neighbour countries, is continuing its unlawful occupation of Namibia and carrying out repressions against the patriots, who demand an end to the inhuman apartheid system. It has been declared that the Soviet Union always sides with the "frontline" states, among them Zimbabwe, declares for an immediate granting of independence to Namibia on the basis of the whole totality of the U. N. decisions, including Security Council Resolution 435, which was adopted in 1978. The USSR has given and will continue giving assistance to the South-West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the sole and genuine representative of the Namibian people.

Andrey Gromyko and Robert Gabriel Mugabe expressed the conviction that the Soviet-Zimbabwean contacts at all levels, also along the line of parliaments, will make a considerable positive contribution to the development of friendly relations between the two countries.

Kremlin Dinner

LD021942 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 2 Dec 85

[Excerpt] At the Great Kremlin Palace, the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers gave a dinner in honor of the Zimbabwean party-state delegation led by Robert Mugabe. Comardes Ryzhkov, Ligachev, Shevardnadze, Ponomarev and Zimyanin were present at the dinner from the Soviet side. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov and Robert Mugabe made speeches at the dinner. In his speech, Comrade Ryzhkov stressed that the Soviet-Zimbabwean talks, which started today, revealed proximity and coincidence of the two countries' interests on a wide range of issues.

Ryzhkov Speech

LD021830 Moscow TASS in English 1752 GMT 2 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 2 TASS -- "The policy of friendship and cooperation, pursued by our country towards African states, is a long-term policy of principle which meets the interests of the people and serves the cause of peace and progress. It is by these principles that we are guiding ourselves in building up our relations of friendship with the Republic of Zimbabwe." This was stated by Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

He made a speech at a dinner in the Kremlin today which was given by the CPSU Central Committee and the Council of Ministers of the USSR in honour of a party and government delegation of the Republic of Zimbabwe led by Gabriel Mugabe, president, first secretary of the Zimbabwe African National Union -- Patriotic Front (ZANU-PF) and prime minister of the republic.

The Soviet-Zimbabwean talks which began today "identified the closeness or identity of the interests of both countries on a broad range of issues," said Nikolay Ryzhkov. This holds true first and foremost of the most urgent problem of our time: The problem of war and peace, he said.

The world at large has welcomed with satisfaction and hope if Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan in Geneva. [Sentence as received]

Touching upon the results of the Soviet-American summit meeting Nikolay Ryzhkov said that "the Soviet Union's course of bridling the arms race and improving the international situation, which was being consistently pursued in Geneva as well, is winning ever broader support and approval.

"This makes us even more confident of the practicality and great potentials of energetic interaction of all the countries and political and public forces which are trying to avert the threat of nuclear catastrophe looming over mankind."

The emergent countries' course of strengthening their political and economic independence is not to everyone's liking. But it is a reality and, moreover, an objective need. The peoples are themselves, choosing ways for their development and their friends and allies. The Soviet Union is fully in solidarity with them in this respect and has constantly been giving the emergent countries selfless support.

Mugabe Speech

LD022242 Moscow TASS in English 2115 GMT 2 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 2 TASS -- "Zimbabwe and other developing countries are greatly concerned about the current world situation. In particular, we feel insecure about the tense relations between the two world blocs, heightened by the current race in the production of nuclear arms," said Robert Mugabe. The president and first secretary of the Zimbabwe African National Union -- Patriotic Front and prime minister of the Republic of Zimbabwe, Robert Gabriel Mugabe, spoke today in the Kremlin at a dinner given in honour of the party and government delegation led by him.

"We are grateful and encouraged by the fact that the recent historic meeting of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan took place and that it might be the beginning of a new climate of world peace and understanding. I wish to commend your efforts, statesmanship and vision in trying to reduce the current world tension in favour of world peace and security," Robert Mugabe said.

"Zimbabwe joins the rest of the world in hoping that much more will be achieved in future meetings, that is the halting of the nuclear arms race leading to total disarmament," Robert Mugabe said. Zimbabwe, like all non-aligned countries, stands firmly opposed to the extension of the arms race into outer space nor does it accept the concept of "star wars."

"What the world wants and is earnestly yearning for is the ultimate elimination of the nuclear threat to human civilisation," Robert Mugabe pointed out.

He spoke out in favour of support of the oppressed people of South Africa and the Namibians in their just struggle against their oppressors and colonisers and called upon the international community to exert every pressure possible, including the imposition and effective enforcement of mandatory economic sanctions against the obstinate racist regime in Pretoria.

"Zimbabwe notes with satisfaction and gratitude the moral and material support, which the Soviet Union and other socialist countries give to those in our region and other parts of the world struggling for their freedom and human rights," Robert Mugabe said.

In conclusion Robert Mugabe spoke out in favour of close friendship between the Soviet Union and Zimbabwe.

Further on Dinner

LD022055 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 2 Dec 85

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers gave a dinner on 2 December in the Great Kremlin Palace in honor of the party and government delegation of the Republic of Zimbabwe. Comrade Ryzhkov spoke at the dinner.

The friendly visit to the Soviet Union of the party and government delegation of the Republic of Zimbabwe, he said, is an event of great importance in our bilateral relations. The socialist goals proclaimed at the Second Congress by the ZANU (PF) [Zimbabwean African National Union -- Patriotic Front] party are close to and understood by us. Evidently, our experience in socialist construction and use in our progress along the road of the Great October of the fundamental advantages of socialism are also of interest to Zimbabwe.

The Soviet-Zimbabwean talks which started today revealed the closeness and coincidence of the interests of the two countries on a wide range of topics. This relates first and foremost to the most pressing problem of today -- the problem of war and peace, to their mutual aspiration to actively cooperate in the name of insuring for all people peaceful conditions of life and work, and for free development along the chosen path.

We respect the active stance of Zimbabwe in the struggle for peace and cooperation between peoples, stressed Comrade Ryzhkov. International confidence in the policy of that country was shown by the selection of the capital of Zimbabwe, the city of Harare, as the place for holding next year the 8th conference of the heads of state and government of nonaligned countries.

The Soviet Union highly assesses the role and significance of the Nonaligned Movement as a factor acting in favor of peace, equal rights, freedom, and independence of peoples.

The policy of friendship and cooperation which our country conducts in relation to states of Africa is principled and long term. It responds to the interests of the peoples, and serves the cause of peace and progress. It is precisely those principles which guide us in building our friendly relations with the Republic of Zimbabwe.

In conclusion Comrade Ryzhkov wished the party and state leadership of the Republic of Zimbabwe and its people great successes in strengthening independence, in development by means of socio-economic upsurge, and prosperity. He said he favors strengthe-strengthening friendship and cooperation between the CPSU and ZANU(PF), between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Zimbabwe, and between the Soviet and Zimbabwean peoples.

In a speech in reply Robert Mugabe expressed thanks for the warmth and hospitality shown to the Zimbabwe delegation in Moscow. Our visit to the Soviet Union, he stressed is a mission of friendship, necessitated by the feelings of comradeship, mutual resepct, and love existing between the peoples of Zimbabwe and the Soviet Union.

Mugabe expressed confidence that the present excellent bilateral relations could become even stronger since they are built on a firm foundation, which has its roots in the days when the oppressed people of Zimbabwe were conducting a bitter struggle against colonialism, imperialism, and international capitalism.

Meets Gorbachev

LD030844 Moscow TASS in English 0822 GMT 3 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 3 TASS -- The conversation between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and President and First Secretary of the Zimbabwe African National Union - Patriotic Front (ZANU-PF), Prime Minister of the Republic of Zimbabwe Robert Gabriel Mugabe started in the Kremlin today.

Robert Mugabe arrived in Moscow on Monday for an official visit at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers at the head of a party and government delegation.

PONOMAREV RECEIVES SENEGAL PARTY DELEGATION

PM021121 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Dec 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Meeting at CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] B.N. Ponomarev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and R.A. Ulyanovskiy, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Section, have received a delegation from the Independence and Labor Party of Senegal [PIT] headed by A. Dansokho, general secretary of the PIT Central Committee.

Those taking part in the meeting exchanged information on their parties' activity. Emphasis was placed on the importance of the unity and cohesion of all democratic progressive forces in the struggle against the aggressive policy of imperialism, neocolonialism, and racism, and for peace, the elimination of the threat of war, and the ending of thearms race.

The PIT representatives assessed highly the Leninist foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state and stressed that this policy's peace-loving and constructive nature was convincingly demonstrated again during the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva.

CPSU DELEGATION ATTENDS MPLA CONGRESS

LD021314 Moscow TASS in English 1122 GMT 2 Dec 85

[Text] Luanda, December 2 TASS -- The second congress of the MPLA [Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola] Workers' Party started its work in Luanda today. It is attended by over 700 delegates representing 35,000 party members.

The participation in the work of the congress of numerous delegations of communist and workers' parties, national liberation movements and progressive organizations from the whole world confirms the growth of the prestige of revolutionary Angola. Among the participants is a delegation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union headed by Geydar Aliyev, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Chairman of the MPLA-Workers' Party, president of the People's Republic of Angola Jose Eduardo dos Santos has delivered at the congress the report of the Party's Central Committee. He noted that in the past five years the MPLA-Workers' Party had been successfully coping with the task, set by its first extraordinary congress -- it has been increasingly turning into the vanguard party of the working class, acting in close unity with the peasant masses, progressive intellectuals, all who share ideas of revolutionary proletariat.

The conditions in which people's Angola is living and fighting, remain stern, it was noted in the report. The apartheid regime of South Africa, supported by American imperialism, is destabilising the situation in countries of the region, it continues illegally occupying the territory of Namibia, and using it as a springboard for aggressions against people's Angola. In these conditions it is necessary to steadily enhance revolutionary vigilance and combat readiness of the Angolan people.

Jose Eudardo Dos Santos noted with gratitude the all-round internationalist aid to Angola by socialist countries, above all the Soviet Union and Cuba, which are the important guarantee of the defence of Angola's territorial integrity, sovereignty and revolutionary gains.

Before the party forum opened the CPSU delegation laid a wreath to the burial vault of Agostinho Neto, the founder of the MPLA-Worker's party and first president of the People's Republic of Angola.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE GREETS MPLA CONGRESS

PM021205 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 85 First Edition p 1

[Text] To the Second MPLA-Labor Party Congress

Dear Comrades!

The CPSU Central Committee sends fraternal greetings to the delegates of the Second MPLA-Labor Party [Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola-Labor Party] Congress.

Your party is the acknowledged vanguard of the Angolan people. Under its leadership, an independent state -- the People's Republic of Angola -- was created 10 years ago and the struggle was launched to overcome the consequences of colonialism and create the conditions for the building of a society free from the exploitation of man by man. The MPLA-Labor Party has approached its second congress still more convinced of the correctness and vitality of its ideals.

Your congress is taking place in a complex international situation. Imperialist circles are trying to halt the process of progressive changes in the world and playing a dangerous game with mankind's future. In southern Africa, as everywhere, they seek to suppress the forces of national and social liberation. The aggressvie actions which the South African racists, supported and encouraged by the United States, have launched against Angola are an integral part of this policy.

In difficult conditions the Angolan people and their party are doing great creative work, rebuffing external and internal reaction, and making a worthy contribution to the cause of the struggle for peace and the elimination of the last seats of colonialism and racism on the African continent.

Communists and all the Soviet people express their international solidarity with you, dear comrades.

Relations between the Soviet Union and Angola are developing on the firm foundations of the Treaty on Friendship and Cooperation between our countries. Our friendship is based on the fraternal ties between the CPSU and the MPLA-Labor party, which have withstood the test of time and will continue to develop and strengthen.

We wish the participants in the Second MPLA-Labor party Congress fruitful and successful work.

The CPSU Central Committee.

BRIEFS

USSR RED CROSS AID -- Ten metric tons of relief aid given to the Uganda Red Cross Society by its Soviet counterpart has arrived in Uganda. The consignment includes medicaments, baby nutrition food, and blankets. They were handed over to the director of the Uganda Red Cross Society, Mr Peter Oryema at Entebbe Airport today by the Soviet ambassador to Uganda, Mr Sergey Bukin. In a brief speech at the ceremony the envoy said that the assistance was in line with the concern of the people of the Soviet Union for the people of Uganda. In reply, the permanent secretary in the ministry of foreign affairs, Mr Francis (Kasige) expressed gratitude for such an on time assistance which he said illustrates the good relations between the people of Uganda and the Soviet Union. [Text] [Kampala Domestic Service in English 1700 GMT 2 Nov 85 EA]

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON USSR SUPREME SOVIET

Balmont Address

PM291147 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 5

["Abbreviated version" of speech by B.V. Balmont, USSR minister of machine building industry and deputy from Udmurt ASSR's Glazovskiy Electoral Okrug, at 26 November afternoon session of USSR Supreme Soviet of Nationalities]

[Text] Esteemed comrade deputies! Soviet people followed with great interest the course of the Geneva meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan. Machine tool builders, like all Soviet people, warmly approve the results of the meeting.

The Draft State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR and the Draft USSR State Budget submitted for examination by the Supreme Soviet accord, in their principled thrust, with the party's strategic course of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development. I support the proposals put forward -- to approve and ratify with amendments and additions the plan and budget for the 1st year of the new 5-year plan.

If we are to speak of our sector's decisive role in the current 5-year plan, it is above all a certain contribution to the technical renewal of the production potential of machine building. In the 11th 5-Year Plan the national economy will receive from enterprises of the Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry more than 980,000 items of metal-working equipment, including 47,000 machine tools with digital program control. The introduction and rational utilization in the national economy of the whole volume of metal-working and casting equipment and tools manufactured by our sector in the support 5-year plan makes it possible, according to expert assessments, to achieve an annual saving of R2.7 billion, notionally to release 380,000 people, and to save 2.7 million tons of metal.

At the same time, objectively assessing the situation, it should be noted that a number of major tasks in the sphere of technical progress in the sector are not being fully resolved. There is still a shortage of certain types of special and high-precision equipment. Machine tools and machines of the new generations are not produced in sufficient quantities. It is by no means in all types of output that the technical standard and quality are up to the pressing tasks of machine building's development.

On the basis of the role assigned to machine tool building in ensuring a powerful boost to machine building, we envisage higher rates of output growth in the sector, compared with the machine building complex as a whole, in the plans being elaborated. In the final stage of the drafting of the plan for 1986, the ministry improved on its original version, increasing indicators in the light of the decisions of the April plenum of the party Central Committee and the directives of the conference held at the CPSU Central Committee in August of this year on questions of the drawing up of plans for the USSR's economic and social development. In particular, the rate of growth in the production of commodity output in 1986 is set at 7.8 percent, as against an annual average of 6 percent in the current 5-year plan. Labor productivity will increase by 7.9 percent in 1986.

The plan provides for a sharp turn toward the organization of larger-scale production of automated equipment and progressive types of tools. There will be a preferential rate of development in the production of the "processing center" type of machine tools (145-percent growth), flexible production modules (128 percent), and industrial robots (155 percent). The output of general-purpose machine tools with manual control is to be reduced by more than 20,000 items.

At the same time it must be noted that the further development of the designs of metal-working equipment and the creation of fundamentally new machine tools and machines are inseparably linked with the provision of the modern subassemblies which machine tool building needs. The work being done by the Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems and the Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry to develop new control systems and electric drives is not yet ensuring the development and production of articles which are up to world standards.

The party Central Committee's instructions on the need to devote paramount attention to improving machine tool building are reflected in practical terms in the planning of capital investments. Out of a total of R847 million in capital investments, R747.5 million are to go to production construction in 1986, which is 30 percent more than the plan for this year. The structure of capital investments in changing in the direction of considerably increasing the allocation of funds for retooling and reconstruction (60 percent). Approximately 78 percent of the increase in capacities will be due to re-tooling of existing enterprises.

Capital investments totaling R100 million are earmarked for nonproduction facilities. Housing construction will absorb R90 million of this.

It has to be said that the capital construction situation in the sector is not satisfactory. In this connection, without suggesting that the ministry bears no responsibility for the situation, I would ask the leaders of construction ministries to pay greater attention to our construction projects. We also expect the USSR Gosplan to issue the relevant contract work quotas when determining capital investment volumes. [Applause]

S.A. Afanasyev Speech

PM291554 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 3

[Abbreviated version" of speech by S.A. Afanasyev, USSR minister of heavy and transport machine building and deputy from Leninskiy Electoral Okruk, Sverdlovsk Oblast, at 26 November afternoon session of USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union]

[Text] Esteemed comrade deputies! All our country's working people, from ministers to workers, ardently support the party's course of improving the international situation. A peaceful life is the guarantee of the effective fulfillment of the majestic plans for the country's socioeconomic development.

The draft plan of the Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building for 1986 and the 12th 5-Year Plan has been drawn up on the basis of the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee April and October (1985) Plenums and the CPSU Central Committee Guidelines on Accelerating Scientific and Technical Progress. It is planned to obtain the entire growth in production volume in 1986 through increased labor productivity.

The plan for the sector, in which the individual nature of production predominates, is very intensive. The production of consumer goods will be increased by 10.3 percent. It is planned to assimilate 80 new types of goods. We are working to ensure that production of basic consumer goods is based on mass production line technology and the allocation of individual production units, which will ensure good quality and the necessary level of production.

The targeted comprehensive programs for the development and retooling of every heavy machine building enterprise and association and the sector as a whole in 1986 and the 5-year plan are the core of all our work. We have been drawing up these programs for more than 18 months and they combine current tasks (things that can be done quickly) and long-term tasks. We have set the task of reaching the highest modern technical standards in terms of all main articles.

The verification of main articles carried out jointly with the State Committee for Science and Technology has shown that only one-half of articles match up to the necessary standard, 42 percent require modernization, and 8 percent of articles ought to be removed from production. In 1986 we plan to organize production of more than 250 types of new machines. Particular attention is being paid to fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolutions on the reconstruction and retooling of ferrous metallurgy. In 1986 we will manufacture 8 continuous steel casting machines instead of the 5 produced in 1985.

Unfortunately, we have long been unable to resolve the question of the reconstruction of the Riga Railroad Car Plant, without which it is impossible to increase production of streetcars and electric trains and to improve their quality. This is the only plant manufacturing electric trains. It is, of course, necessary to deal with microelectronics, but we must not forget about streetcars and electric trains, whose production we must increase in order to create normal conditions for transporting people.

In accordance with criticisms, this year the sector will fully ensure deliveries of oil-well-drilling equipment for the Tyumen region. Work is being carried out to increase the service life of drilling equipment from 7 to 10 years. We are developing and preparing for the production of insulated drilling installations for northern conditions.

In this great work to accelerate scientific and technical progress it would be desirable for the personal material interest of designers and technologists to be linked with increasing the technical standard and efficiency of each article they produce. It is also necessary to assess objectively the technical standard of articles, since certain sectorial institutes do not always assess standards objectively.

It is necessary to enhance the role and responsibility of the State Committee for Science and Technology and to objectively establish the standard of the analogous product with which comparisons are made. A systematic approach and order are needed in this. The complex of measures to enhance technological standards and production organization are an important avenue of the targeted programs.

Associations and enterprises have been working since the start of 1984 under conditions of the economic experiment, which has given an additional boost to increasing production efficiency. It has had a positive influence on improving delivery discipline. However, we have not yet ensured the fulfillment of the state plan and the plan for capital construction by all enterprises. It is very important that opportunities exist for new forms and methods of work. We must work further on economic incentives. Collectives themselves must earn the funds for housing, kindergartens, and the renewal of equipment.

The sector's enterprises have fulfilled the plan for the 1st 10 months and the plan for the whole year will be fulfilled. We are preparing to fulfill the plan for 1986. Labor collectives, having joined in socialist competition, are preparing to greet our party's 27th congress with new labor successes. (applause)

PRAVDA Editorial

PM291211 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Nov 85 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Confidence and Optimism"]

[Text] The Land of the Soviets is living through a crucial moment of its history. Preparation for the 27th CPSU Congress has begun everywhere and a broad, truly nationwide discussion of documents of tremendous theoretical and political importance is under way. Soviet people are confirming by word and deed their active support for the party's strategic line toward the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development. They are seeking to complete this year with the best results and to create the groundwork for a confident start to the next, 12th, 5-Year Plan. They have a great desire to use their constructive labor and their readiness for all-around international cooperation to promote the conservation and consolidation of peace on earth.

The work of the latest session of the USSR Surpeme Soviet of the 11th convocation was held 26-27 November in this atmosphere of high political and labor enthusiasm. The supreme organ of state power examined vitally important questions of creation and peace. It approved the country's plan and budget for 1986 and assessed the results of the recent Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva.

In his speeches at the session M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, defined with the utmost clarity the basic avenues for the Soviet Government's activity and clearly described the features of our plan for the forthcoming year, which opens a qualitatively new stage in the development of Soviet society. It is important, he noted, to make persistent headway along the course outlined by the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) and subsequent plenums and which has been reflected in very important documents like the drafts of the new edition of the Party Program, and the Basic Guidelines for the country's economic and social development for the 5-year period and the more remote prospect. The Communist Party's policy is like a focus, concentrating our people's interests and will and their desire to ensure that the motherland's economic and defense might is firmer and that the Soviet man lives and works even better.

The plan and budget indicators approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet for the forthcoming year, as the session's participants unanimously noted, accord, in their principled orientation, with the Communist Party's strategic course. The scaling of new heights will be of tremendous importance for the Soviet economy's turn to the path of intensification and the enhancement of its efficiency, for the further improvement of the people's well-being, and for the successful development of the economies and cultures of all the union republics in a single national economic complex.

The state plan and budget for 1986 have a firm foundation in what our country has already achieved and what has already been done recently to implement positive changes in various spheres of the life of Soviet society. The session noted with satisfaction that the large-scale measures adopted by the CPSU Central Committee and Soviet Government to transfer the economy to an intensive development footing and to enhance the effectiveness of the national economy and the practical steps to further introduce order, to strengthen labor and state discipline, to observe a regime of the strictest thrift, and to combat drunkenness and alcoholism are having a fruitful effect.

Thanks to these measures and to the labor collectives' increased activeness, the strenuous efforts of the working class, kolkhoz peasantry, and people's intelligentsia, and the large amount of organizational work performed by the party, soviet, trade union, and economic organs, despite disruptions in a number of national economy sectors at the beginning of this year we have succeeded in rectifying the situation, assuming the necessary tempo, and ensuring that the economy has reached the planned positions. As a result, industry is developing more dynamically, the work of transport is improving, and housing and municipal construction is expanding. The production of agricultural output, including grain, is growing compared with last year, and purchases of livestock and poultry, milk and eggs are increasing. The average wage of workers and employees this year will reach R190, while the wages of kolkhoz members in the public economy will be in excess of R150 a month and payments and benefits from social consumption funds will outstrip the plans. In other words our affairs have started to take a turn for the better, which is evidence to the correctness of the course steered by the party.

Those taking part in the session did not overlook the serious shortcomings which are having an adverse effect on the progress in fulfilling plan targets. They pointed to manifestations of dilatoriness in overcoming the lag and transferring to intensive methods of economic management and the inadequate standard of organizational work in a number of national economy sectors. It was noted that individual ministries are failing to ensure the fulfillment of targets for labor productivity growth, the saving of fuel and energy resources, metal, timber, and raw materials, or the introduction of new equipment and advanced technology and have been unable to achieve the stable buildup of the production of output or an improvement in its quality. Not all associations and enterprises are completely fulfilling their contract commitments for deliveries. Construction workers are failing to cope with the plan for commissioning fixed capital and production capacities. A number of union republics are failing to fulfill plan indicators for commodity turnover. Economic leaders are sometimes operating in an old-fashioned way.

Headway along the path projected by the party demands the combination of a creative approach toward the tasks set by life with purposefulness and a high degree of discipline and self-sacrifice. Only thus is it possible to put into operation our enormous reserves and use them to the maximum.

A very important feature of the plan targets for the forthcoming year is the fact that the growth tempo set out in them exceeds the average annual tempo for the current 5-year period. Thus it is planned to increase the national income 3.8 percent, the volume of industrial output 4.3 percent, the volume of agricultural output 4.4 percent, and labor productivity 3.8 percent. One feature of the plan for 1986 is that from the very start of the next 5-year period it has set a specific rhythm and assumed a faster tempo.

Another feature of the plan is the consideration of the need to accelerate scientific-technical progress and the implementation of targets for priority avenues of science, technology, and engineering including the creation of models of machinery and equipment of new generations. Substantial changes have been outlined for the most important national income, which will make it possible to increase capital investments with a view to modernizing and retooling production.

The plan indicators for the new year are also distinguished by the fact that they are geared to the implementation of the practical transition to intensive methods of economic management and they attach great importance to economy and thrift, to the use of progressive resource-saving manufacturing methods in industry and transport, and to the introduction of industrial manufacturing methods in agriculture and construction.

For instance, it is planned to obtain 97 percent of the increase in the national income through labor productivity growth, to reduce material expenditure by R3.6 billion throughout the national economy as a whole, and to considerably expand the introduction of secondary resources into production. Saving and a resolute struggle against instance of extravagance and thriftlessness should result in a real return.

The USSR plan and budget are imbued with the concern of the Communist Party and Soviet state to further enhance the people's well-being and improve all aspects of Soviet people's lives. They provide for a substantial increase in the population's real per capita incomes, an increase in expenditure on the better provision of housing and medical and sociocultural services for working people, the development of education, and the training of cadres and improvement of their qualifications. It is planned to improve the population's provision of foodstuffs on the basis of the fulfillment of the Food Program targets and to increase the production and sale of consumer goods and the supply of a broader range of various services.

As before, our plans now have a graphically expressed peaceful and constructive nature. At the same time they consider the need to strengthen the country's security and defense capability.

M. S. Gorbachev's report at the session convincingly revealed the close interconnection between the peaceful Soviet initiatives and the Soviet state's entire foreign policy and the peaceful orientation of our domestic policy and the creative content of the Soviet people's aspirations and concerns. It sets forth a principled assessment of the recent Soviet-U. S. summit meeting in Geneva in the context of the present international situation and taking into account the experience of the past, the prospects for the future, and the specific tasks we have to resolve.

The Geneva meeting, as the CPSU Central Committee Politburo noted, in examining its results, was a very important political event of international life. A fundamentally important result of the meeting was that the leaders of the USSR and the United States stated in their joint document that nuclear war must not be unleashed. They stressed the importance of preventing any war -- nuclear or conventional -- between the USSR and the United States and undertook not to seek to achieve military superiority. In that sense the results of the Geneva talks could have positive influence on changing the political and psychological climate in present international relations and on normalizing them and could reduce the threat of the outbreak of nuclear war. The meeting laid the foundation for dialogue with a view to achieving changes for the better in Soviet-U. S. relations and in the world in general.

The USSR Supreme Soviet session noted that the Geneva dialogue, the path to which was long and hard, was necessary and useful and its overall balance was undoubtedly a positive one. But, of course, the real significance of everything on which the sides agreed in Geneva can only be manifested in practical deeds, in the determination to specifically seek to curtail the arms race, to prevent it in space, to normalize the international situation, and develop all-around cooperation.

The USSR's supreme organ of state power fully approved M. S. Gorbachev's activity in implementing the Soviet Union's Leninist peace-loving foreign policy at the Geneva meeting with U. S. President R. Reagan. The USSR Supreme Soviet stated in a specially adopted resolution that the Soviet Union will continue firmly and purposefully to steer a principled course toward eliminating the nuclear threat and developing international relations in a spirit of peaceful coexistence and detente.

This course is receiving Soviet people's ardent support, is approved by our friends and allies, is finding broad understanding in the world, and is being welcomed with hope by all peoples of the world.

The decisions taken by the USSR Supreme Soviet accord with the interests of every Soviet person and all people of goodwill. It is necessary to work well for the implementation of our plans and to display initiative and enthusiasm. It is important to explain extensively and to bring to every person the profound purport and significance of the tasks which have been set and to organize effective socialist competition to achieve the projected goals.

Our plans for the forthcoming year are stepped up but realistic. We are sure, the session pointed out, that every Communist, every worker, every peasant, every engineer and scientist, and every labor collective will fulfill its duty with an awareness of its high responsibility to the motherland. We are sure that everything will be done at every workplace to ensure that plans are successfully fulfilled and overfulfilled, that our country becomes even richer and more powerful, and that the cause of peace on earth strengthens and triumphs.

IZVESTIYA Editorial

PM291309 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "The Only Correct Path"]

[Text] April 1985 has gone down in the history of our party and our country. During those spring days, our Leninist party's Central Committee plenum elaborated a course to accelerate society's socioeconomic development, laid the foundations for significant changes in the approach to resolving economic and political tasks, and gave our entire life a new rhythm.

Consistently, persistently, and energetically translating this course into the language of everyday deeds, the CPSU Central Committee and Soviet Government have adopted a number of major measures to accelerate the economy's transition to an intensive development footing and make the management of the national economy more efficient. Before our very eyes and with our involvement practical steps are being taken to increase order, strengthen labor and state discipline and the policy of strictest thrift, and combat drunkenness and alcoholism.

The party's political course -- both on questions of domestic life and on international problems -- is reflected most fully in the major theoretical and political documents which will be presented for examination to the 27th CPSU Congress -- the draft new edition of the CPSU Program, the draft amendments to the Party Statutes, and the Basic Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1986-1990 and the Period Through 2000.

The initial steps in the party's great consultation with the people that has begun in the country demonstrate that the documents submitted for discussion are a cause of profound satisfaction to Soviet people. Active support for the party's strategic course -- support in both word and deed -- is the source of our optimism and confidence that the path chosen is correct and that what has been planned will be unfailingly fulfilled.

It was in this atmosphere of changes and against the clear background of those changes that the 4th session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, 11th Convocation, was held. It discussed the most important questions of the Soviet state's domestic and foreign policy.

The laws on the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR and the State Budget for 1986, adopted by the session, are of tremendous significance for our country, its present and future, and for every labor collective and Soviet family. The year 1986 is not just the 1st year of the 12th 5-Year Plan: it also opens a qualitatively new stage in Soviet society's development.

The 1986 plan reflects the party's strategic line of accelerating the country's socio-economic development. It envisages increased rates of growth of national income and labor productivity and a substantial increase in the production of industrial and agricultural output. Material resources will be used more efficiently. Priority is given to the development of those sectors designed to ensure scientific and technical progress and improved output quality. Measures have been planned to accelerate the reconstruction, renewal, and modernization of production and improve management and the economic mechanism. The further improvement of the people's well-being is envisaged.

All this graphically demonstrates the peaceful, creative character of our work. Our foreign policy aspirations and the Soviet state's international policy are also closely linked to the peaceful thrust of our domestic policy.

That is why the USSR Supreme Soviet deputies listened with such very profound attention to M.S. Gorbachev's report "On the Results of the Soviet-U.S. Summit in Geneva and the International Situation." And that is also why they discussed this report with an awareness of their very profound and, to be blunt, historic responsibility. The USSR Supreme Soviet unanimously adopted a resolution on this report, fully approving the activity of Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, aimed at pursuing the Soviet Union's Leninist peace-loving foreign policy, at the meeting with U.S. President R. Reagan in Geneva on 19-21 November 1985.

The Geneva meeting represents the materialization of the CPSU Central Committee April plenum's foreign policy guidelines. The plenum, as we know, stressed the need for the all-around activation of the USSR's peace-loving policy across the broadest front of international relations. It called for every effort to be made to prevent the forces of militarism and aggression from prevailing, stressed the urgency of ending the arms race and stepping up the disarmament process, and advocated the development of equal, correct, and civilized relations between states and the expansion and deepening of mutually beneficial economic ties. This approach fully accords with the interests of the Soviet people and the peoples of the socialist states and is greeted with understanding in other countries of the world.

In a period brief yet full of major international events, the Soviet Union has sought cooperation in the interests of peace with the widest range of states. We have proceeded and still proceed from the premise that the period of dangerous tension can only be overcome by the joint efforts of all countries -- great and small. But the reality of the modern world is that it contains states which bear a special responsibility for the character, course, and consequences of world development.

The USSR Supreme Soviet was guided by an understanding of this reality when it noted in its resolution that the Soviet-U.S. summit was both necessary and useful at the present turning point in international relations, under conditions when mankind is faced with the choice of survival or the threat of annihilation.

Mindful of the special responsibility of the USSR and the United States for maintaining peace, the USSR Supreme Soviet considers highly important the mutual understanding achieved between the two states' leaders and expressed in the Soviet-U.S. joint statement to the effect that nuclear war must never be launched and that there can be no winner in it. The recognition by the two sides of the importance of preventing any war -- nuclear or conventional -- between them and the provision that they will never strive to achieve military superiority is also of principled significance.

The Geneva meeting failed to find a solution to the most important questions connected with the task of ending the arms race and strengthening peace, and major differences on problems of principle will continue to exist between the Soviet Union and the United States, but the meeting's results create an opportunity for moving from the present state of dangerous confrontation to a constructive search for ways of normalizing Soviet-U.S. relations and improving the international situation as a whole.

The source of our foreign policy successes -- a policy of peace and cooperation -- lies in the inner nature of the socialist system and in the nationwide support for that policy. That support is found in the daily practical work of the many millions of Soviet people. The results achieved in the national economy are not only economic but also very important moral-political results demonstrating the correctness of our chosen course.

The task is now for every Soviet person and every labor collective, conscious of their high responsibility to the motherland, to do their duty and ensure that our country becomes even richer and more powerful and that the cause of world peace strengthens and triumphs. The 1986 plans are wholly directed toward that.

Sizenko Appointed Minister

LD291845 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 29 Nov 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Yevgeniy Ivanovich Sizenko, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee, as a USSR minister.

CORRECTION TO TEXT OF STATE BUDGET LAW

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "1986 Budget Text" published in the 29 November Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page R 47, last line of table. Statistic for Estonian SSR should read ...1,623,737...(correcting figure).

PRAVDA PUBLISHER GORBACHEV SUPREME SOVIET SPEECH

PM281158 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Nov 85 First Edition pp 1,-2

["Report by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Comrades deputies: Major questions of the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet state are submitted for discussion at the current session of the USSR Supreme Soviet: The laws [zakony] on the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR and the State Budget for 1986, adopted by this session, are of huge significance for our country, its present, and future, and for each labor collective and each Soviet family.

The coming year, 1986, begins not only the first year of the 12th 5-Year Plan, but opens a qualitatively new stage in the development of Soviet society. The plan for 1986 reflects the party's strategic line of acceleration of social and economic development of the country. It envisages high rates of growth in national income, industrial and agricultural output, and labor productivity. There will be a growth of effectiveness of material resource utilization. Priority development of industries which are to ensure scientific-technical progress and raise the quality of production has been defined. Measures have been mapped out for accelerating the reconstruction, renewal, and modernization of production, and the perfection of management and the economic mechanism. A further raising of the people's well-being is envisaged.

It is important, comrades, for all of us constantly to bear in mind the special features of the plan for 1986. Already in the first year of the 5-year plan, and even pace must be set for the whole 5-year plan period. On the basis of this, the rates for the national economy's development for the 1986 have been envisaged such that their fulfillment, together with a gradual build-up of intensity in the following eyars, will ensure a way to fulfillment of the tasks of the 5-year plan period as a whole. This will make it possible to avoid the situation which occurred in the last 5-year plan period when reduced indices were set for the initial years while the main growth was left to the last years.

It is well known to what negative results such a practice led. The second special feature of the draft plan is the fact that in its compilation, maximum account was taken of the need to accelerate scientific and technical progress. On the basis of the directives of the June conference in the CPSU Central Committee, first and foremost tasks for accelerating scientific and technical progress have been included in the draft. They have been envisaged by resolutions on the development of major directions of science and technology in the branches of the national economy. At the same time, the foundations upon which planning came to be based, have been revised to a great.

For the first time, the most important and general indicators of the scientific and technical progress of industries and of its efficiency have been envisaged in the draft. These indices are determined with the aim of intensifying the practical work of ministries, associations, and enterprises to secure the attainment of top targets in the development of science and technology. The next special feature of the plan for 1986 is its orientation toward implementing a practical transfer to intensive methods of management. This is dictated by life itself, by the complicated situation which is developing with labor and material resources, and by the exhaustion of primarily extensive factors in the economy's growth.

Next year, we must ensure that the growth in the volume of production is to a maximum extent secured through savings of resources. In other words, economy is indeed becoming the main source of resource for the whole of the increase in production volume. This is shown by the following figures: Next year 97 percent of the increase in the national income will be obtained on account of labor productivity. Metal consumption of the national income will be reduced by 2.7 percent and power output ratio by 3 percent. Finally, this is a wide transfer to new methods of management which have positively recommended themselves. From January 1986 over a half of all industrial output will be produced at enterprises working in new conditions.

In general, comrades, the line that has been taken is a correct one. Now we have to realize it, both in the process of further studying the plan in industries, republics, krays, oblasts, associations, and enterprises, and of course in concrete, practical work. This aspect must be stressed also because many workers at the center and in the localities, including in the economic planning bodies, have not completely understood the importance of evaluating and solving the economic, social, and financial problems of the country in a new way.

The present session is taking place in a very responsible period, prior to the congress. The April plenum of the Central Committee worked out a policy line directed toward speeding up the society's social and economic development; made a start on substantial changes in the approaches to resolving economic and political tasks; and gave new pace to all the activities of party, state, and administrative organizations, as well as of all our cadres and collectives of workers. The political course of the party, both on issues of domestic life and on international problems, was given its fullest reflection in the most important theoretical and political documents which will be put before the 27th Congress of the CPSU; in the drafts of the new edition of the program of the CPSU and of the changes in the party rules, and in the Basic Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1986-90 and in the Period up to the Year 2000.

The first results of the great consultation underway between the party and the people show that the documents put forward for discussion arouse great satisfaction among Soviet people. Active support for the party's strategic course, support in word and deed, serve as the source of our optimism, our confidence in the correctness of the course chosen and that the targets will be fulfilled without fail. (prolonged applause)

As you know, comrade deputies, recently the Central Committee of the party and the Soviet Government adopted a series of major measures directed at accelerating the transition of the economy onto a course of intensive development, the raising of efficiency, of national economic management. Practical steps are being carried out for further putting things into order: strengthening labor and state discipline, the policy of very strict economies and the fight against drunkenness and alcoholism. In other words, in all spheres of public life, great intensive work has been unleashed, which is already beginning to bear fruit.

The new things which today are entering our life have roused the Soviet people, have activated their creative strengths, and have shown time and again what enormous reserves and possibilities lie in socialist system. We may now firmly say: Things have started to change for the better. The rates of production growth are increasing and other economic indices are improving. Despite the interruptions in a number of sectors of the national economy at the beginning of the year, Soviet people have managed to rectify the situation and secure the attainment of the economy's planned targets. Positive changes also are taking place in the country's agrarian sector.

In the things which have been achieved, an enormous contribution has been made by our heroic working class, which, not sparing strength and energy, and overcoming difficulties, has done everything possible to fulfill the designated plans. In the positive results there is the intensive labor by the collective farm peasantry, all workers of the agro-industrial complex; in our achievements there is the creative thought of scientists, engineers, and the people's intelligentsia. Soviet youth, which boldly and energetically tackles the resolution of difficult and complex tasks and actively supports the changes taking place in society linking its future with them, has been a pioneer and initiator of many important beginnings. We also link these changes with the stepping up of the activity of party, administrative, and trade union organs and all our cadres.

In a word, comrade deputies, a great deal is being done. It would, however, be a mistake to overestimate all this; but this is not in our traditions anyway. We are at the beginning of a projected path, a path which is difficult and intense, demanding the combination of a creative approach to the tasks that life puts forward, with purposefulness, high discipline, and self-sacrifice. We have enormous reserves and possibilities and we have to work solidly to put them into action and use them to the fullest.

This has to be done on all fronts of economic, social, and cultural construction, above all where the situation remains complex and delays are being overcome slowly. Now, in the final stage of the 5-year plan, it is necessary to work well in order to start, beginning next year, a confident and dynamic advancement, to assure the achievement of outlined goals, and to create prerequisites for the further qualitative transformation of productive forces of the country.

Comrades, the plan for 1986 illustrates graphically the peaceful creative character of our concerns. Our foreign political aspirations and the international policy of Soviet state are closely linked with such a peaceful trend of domestic policy. The foreign policy directives of the April plenum of the party Central Committee were a concrete expression of Leninist foreign policy at the present stage. The plenum underlined the necessity to activize in every way the peaceloving policy of the USSR on the broadest possible front of international relations. It made a call for everything possible to be done for the forces of militarism and aggression not to prevail. It underlined the urgency of halting the arms race, of stepping up the process of disarmament. It advocated the development of equal, correct, civilized relations among states, and the broadening and deepening of mutually advantageous economic relations. These directives of the plenum were dictated by the times, specific features of the situation that has taken shape, and by the needs of the socialist policy of peace and progress. In its assessment, the Central Committee Politburo proceeded from the fact that as a result of the continuing arms race the degree of unpredictibility of events increases. The possibility of the militarization of space marks an entirely new jump in the arms race, which would inevitably lead to the disappearance of the very concept of strategic stability, the basis of the preservation of peace in the nuclear age. A situation would be created when fundamentally important decisions, irreversible in their possible consequences, in essence would be taken by computers without the participation of human reason and political will, not taking into account criteria morals an morality. Such a development could lead to universal disaster even if triggered by mistake, miscalculation, or technical failure of extremely complex computer systems. In other words, the development of world events has reached a point where particularly responsible decisions are needed, when inaction or delay in action are criminal because the issue today is that of preserving civilization and life itself.

This is why we considered and still consider it necessary to adopt all measures to break the vicious circle of the arms race and not lose a single change to turn the course of events around toward an improvement. The issue today is posed in a supremely sharp and defined way. We must rise above narrow interests and recognize the collective responsibility of those states before the danger which lies in wait for the community of mankind on the threshold of the third millenium. It was precisely this approach that the April plenum of the Central Committee empowered us to adopt in implementing foreign policy. This approach fully meets the interests of the Soviet people, the peoples of the Socialist states, and as we became convinced, meets with understanding in ohter countries of the world.

Over a short period of time, but crammed with major international events, the Soviet Union has been striving to fact in concert with the very widest circle of states in the interests of peace. Our basis was and is that to emerge from the phase of dangerous tension is only possible through the efforts of all countries, great and small.

Over the past months, political and economic links among the countries of the socialist community have become significantly more active and deep. Long-term programs of cooperation in the field of economics and scientific and technical progress have been worked out; a mechanism of energetic, concrete links has been set up, and coordination of foreign policy activity is becoming closer.

The meetings of leaders of fraternal countries in Moscow, Warsaw, Sofia, and Prague have become important landmarks on the road toward further consolidating the socialist community. Links with all socialist countries are developing and strengthening. Cooperation with states which have freed themselves from the yoke of colonial oppression and who are members of the Non-Aligned Movement is taking on a wider character. Significant steps have been made in developing relations with many of these countries. This is a factor of enormous significance in the troubled sea of contemporary international relations, a factor acting in favor of peace, equal rights, freedom, and independence for the peoples.

The Soviet Union also is putting effort into improving links with capitalist states. I would single out especially the recent Soviet-French meeting in Paris, during which substantial steps were taken to develop further bilateral cooperation, to strengthen European and international security, and toward a return to detente. We will continue to build our foreign policy on a multiplane basis, on the basis of firm and stable bilateral relations with all countries. However, the reality of the present-day world is such that it contains states which, by virtue of their military, economic and scientific-technical potential, and international weight, bear particular responsibility for the nature of world development, its progress and consequences. First and foremost such responsibility -- I stress, not a privilege but a responsibility -- is borne by the Soviet Union and the United States of America. If one approaches matters from these positions, the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting which took place last week was, in the estimation of the Central Committee Politburo, an important event not just in our bilateral relations, but also in world politics as a whole.

I have already had occasion to speak of my first impressions of the talks with the U.S. President at the press conference in Geneva. The final document of the meeting, the joint statement, is also well known. Today, speaking at this session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, I would like to appraise the results and the significance of the Geneva meeting in the context of the present-day situation, taking into account the experience of the past, and the prospects for the future and the tasks we have to solve. First of all I must say that the path to the Geneva dialogue was long and not easy for many reasons.

The U.S. Administration that came to power at the beginning of the eighties openly took a course toward confrontation, rejecting the very possibility of a positive development of Soviet-U.S. relations. I think that everyone recalls the intensity of the anti-Soviet rhetoric of those years, the "strong-arm" nature of the U.S. ruling circles. The joint efforts of many years to create the necessary minimum of confidence in these relations were committed to oblivion. Almost all the threads of bilateral cooperation were sundered. Detente itself was declared as being counter to U.S. interests. Having taken up a course toward military superiority over the USSR, the administration began the realization of programs for re-equipping the United States with nuclear and other arms. The deployment (razvertyvaniye] of U.S. first-strike missiles began in Western Europe. A situation was created which was fraught with a high level of military-political uncertainty and its attendant risks. And finally, in addition, the "star wars" program, the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" appeared. Washington seized on this idea, not giving much thought to the grave consequences which are inevitable in the event of its realization.

The idea of taking weapons into space is extremely dangerous for all the peoples of the world, without exception. But we know something else: This policy of the United States must inevitably lead to a clash with realities. That is what happened. The Soviet Union, together with its allies, stated clearly: Military superiority over us will not be permitted. Even among the allies of the United States there arose confusion in the face of this evident disregard for the interests of their security and Washington's readiness to put everything at stake in pursuit of the chimera of military superiority. This course aroused serious doubts even in the United States itself. The proclamation of the plan for the preparation of "star wars" resounded like an alarm throughout the planet. Those who thought that their line toward a confrontation would become the determinant one for international development were mistaken. I will add, perhaps, in this connection, that dreams of world domination are false from the outset. Both as far as the purpose and the means are concerned. Just as the idea of perpetual motion comes from a lack of knowledge of the elementary laws of nature, imperial claims grow from a picture of the present-day world that is far removed from reality.

The Soviet Union has coupled its firm rebuff to the U.S. line toward disturbing the military-strategic balance with the promotion of large-scale peace initiatives and a display of restraint and constructive attitude in the approach to the central issues of peace and security. By our initiatives, and these amount to quite a few, we have clearly demonstrated what we are striving for in the world -- aims which we call the United States and its allies to strive for. These actions of the USSR have met with the warm approval of the world public, and they have been highly appraised by the governments of many countries. Influenced by these factors, Washington has been forced to maneuver. A show of love of peace has appeared in the statements of the U.S. Administration. It has not been backed up by facts, but the very fact that it has been made is symptomatic.

At the beginning of the year, at our initiative, an accord was reached on new talks between the USSR and the United States, talks which were to interlink the whole complex of space and nuclear armaments, and to make their goal the prevention of an arms race in outer space and to end it on earth.

The atmosphere of Soviet-U.S. relations, to some extent, and the international behavior of the United States began to undergo change, and thus of course could not be taken into account when examining the question of the possibility of a summit meeting.

In making such a decision our firm premise was that at the talks, central place must be given to those questions which determine our relations and also the whole world situation, questions of security. And at the same time we took into account the political and strategic realities in Europe and in the world, the opinion of our friends and allies, the positions of governments and public circles of many countries, and insistent appeals to the Soviet Union to do everything possible so that the summit might take place. We realized how much hope was being pinned on this meeting throughout the world, and we took specific steps to improve the international climate and to make it more favorable for the meeting.

At the talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva we put forward specific, radical proposals. What is the gist of these proposals? We proposed primarily to ban completely space strike weapons. We proposed this because starting an arms race in space, and even the deployment [razvertyvaniye] in near-earth space of antimissile systems alone, would not strengthen anyone's security. Covered by a space shield, nuclear attack weapons would become still more dangerous. The appearance of space strike weapons could turn the present strategic balance into strategic chaos, provoke a feverish arms race in all directions and undermine one of the most important foundations of its limitation, the ABM Treaty. As a result, mistrust among countries would grow, but security would be considerably reduced.

Further, together with a complete ban on space strike weapons, we proposed a one-half reduction of all existing USSR and U.S. nuclear weapons capable of reaching one another's territory, and to limit each side's overall number of nuclear warheads on them to a ceiling 6,000 units. That is a radical reduction, measurable in thousands of nuclear warheads. Such an approach is just: It embraces all the weapons which make up the strategic correlation of forces. It makes it possible to take into account the volume of the nuclear threat really existent for each side, independent of how and from where the nuclear warheads are delivered to their territory -- by missile or by aircraft, from one's own territory or from allies' territory.

We regard that 50 percent reduction of the nuclear weapons of the USSR and the United States as a start: We are ready to go further, until complete destruction of nuclear weapons with the participation, of course, of other nuclear states also. Understandably, especial unease is provoked among the European peoples by the nuclear arms race. We well understand this unease. Europe is saturated with nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union advocates complete liberation of Europe from nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical. But the United States and its NATO partners do not agree to this. Then we proposed starting merely interim solutions, later to be extended to further reductions. We are convinced that our proposals are in keeping with the European peoples' hopes of weakening the nuclear threat and increasing Europe's security. I want to stress the fundamental aspect of the matter: In three spheres of the talks -- on space, strategic offensive weapons, and medium-range nuclear weapons -- we are not making any proposals to the United States that would reduce its security.

Moreover, our proposals provide the opportunity for the resolution of such matters which the U.S. side also places among its "particular concerns". For example, much is being said about Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles. Our proposals envisage that the number of these missiles will be reduced; the proportion of their warheads [boyegolovka] within the overall level of nuclear charges [zaryad] will be limited.

Or, to give another example: There is much noise made in the West over the Soviet SS-20 missiles. We are proposing to reduce these considerably in the context of resolving the problem of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe.

The nuclear weapons of Britain and France are the stumbling block. They say that these cannot be discussed at Soviet-U.S. talks. We are ready to seek a solution to this: We propose a direct exchange of views with these countries regarding their nuclear weapons.

The Soviet proposals have been met with a broad and positive reaction worldwide. Behind them is the prestige of the Warsaw Pact states who unanimously support our constructive stance. To a considerable extent, also in accord with our approach is the joint statement by the leaders of six countries -- Argentina, Mexico, Tanzania, India, Sweden and Greece. The Soviet initiative was perceived with approval and hope by the communist and workers' parties, major public organizations of various countries and continents, world-famous scientists, eminent political and military figures. It received a positive reaction from the majority of parties in the Socialist International, not to mention the thousands of letters from Soviet and foreign citizens which arrived for me on the eve of and during the meeting in Geneva. I would like to take this opportunity to express gratitude to their authors for the good wishes, for the advice and support, for their profound and sincere concern for the preservation of peace. [applause]

On the eve of the meeting, the Americans put forward their counterproposals. This is, in itself, a positive fact. One of our numerous initiatives evoked a favorable response. Much has been written in the press about the essence of these counterproposals. I shall not repeat their content. I shall only say that they are proposals which only go halfway, and in many ways are unfair. They are based on a one-sided approach, obviously dictated by a desire for military superiority for the United States and NATO as a whole. But the main point is that the U.S. position does not allow for a ban on the making of offensive space weapons. On the contrary, they want to legalize their creation. The position adopted by the U.S. side on the matter of "star wars" is the main obstacle on the path toward an agreement on arms control. And this is not our opinion alone. The governments of France, Denmark, Norway, Greece, the Neterlands, Canada and Australia also refused to take part in the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative." On the eve of the Geneva meeting, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution calling upon the leaders of the USSR and the United States and some of its allies which considered it possible not to support this clear appeal from the world community. This is a fact, which, as they say, needs no comment.

One should, perhaps, also recall that there were powerful political forces at work in the United States, who were doing everything they could to at least emasculate the content of the meeting, to bring to nought its significance, even to wreck it. I think many people have fresh recollection of actions such as the testing of an anti-satellite system, the appearance of the battleship "Iowa", carrying long-range cruise missiles, in the Baltic, the forced deployment of Pershings in the FRG, the decision to create binary chemical weapons, and finally, the adoption of yet another record military budget, and so on and so forth.

The President was already on his way to Geneva when the letter from the U.S. Defense Secretary became known, which entreated him not to agree to any accord with the USSR that would confirm the treaties on the limitation of strategic arms and antimissile defense, in other words, leaving the United States full freedom of action in all directions of the arms race, both on earth and in space. But was the matter really limited to the Pentagon alone? A sort of order, given to the U.S. President by U.S. ultra-rightwing circles represented by the ideological headquarters of the Heritage Fund, did not excape our attention. The President was instructed to continue the arms race, not to give the Soviet Union the opportunity to switch funds to the realization of socioeconomic programs, and to strive, in the final analysis, to squeeze the USSR out of international politics. These gentlemen went so far as to set the U.S. Administration the task of forcing us to change our system and our constitution.

These are familiar themes, comrades. We have had to listen to all this many times already. In a word, there were a good many attacks. All the same, we made a decision in favor of the meeting with the U.S. President. We made it because we did not have the right to neglect even the slightest chance restraining the dangerous development of events in the world. We made the decision realizing that if we do not manage to start a direct and frank conversation now, tomorrow it will be a hundred times more diffucult, and maybe altogether too late.

There is no argument, the differences between us are enormous. However, in the world today the interlinkage and interdependence between us are so great. The acuteness of the times we are living through does not leave the leaders of the USSR and the United States, the peoples of the USSR and the United States, any alternative but to comprehend the great science of living together. From our very first tet-a-tete with the President -- and such conversations occupied a great deal of the meeting in Geneva -- the question was directly posed that the Soviet delegation had come to seek the solution of the most burning problem which is at the center of international life, the problem of preventing nuclear war and curbing the arms race. As I said to the President, therein lies the basic point of our meeting and this will also determine its results.

I must stress that the talks in Geneva were at times very pointed, I would say frank to the utmost. Here it is impossible to outwit each other or to escape with political and propaganda cliches. Too much depends on these pivotal questions of war and peace. During the talks the U.S. side stubbornly insisted on the realization of its SDI program. We were told that the issue is of the creation of purely defensive means, which are allegedly in no way a weapon. It was said that these means will help to stabilize the situation and get rid of nuclear weapons altogether. It was even proposed that these means be shared sometime in the forseeable future, to open laboratory doors to one another. We frankly told the President that we do not agree with such assessments. We have carefully analyzed all these questions and arrived at the unequivocal conclusion that space weapons are not at all defensive; that they are capable of giving rise to the dangerous illusion that a nuclear first-strike can be made from behind a space "shield," and a counterstrike be prevented, or at least attenuated. What guarantee is there that space weapons themselves would not be used as a means to knock out targets on earth? There is every indication that the U.S. antimissile space system is being planned not as a shield at all, but as part of a single offensive system.

Naturally, we cannot agree with the assertion that the space systems envisaged in his program are not weapons at all, just as we cannot rely on the assurance that the United States will share with us what they succeed in setting up in this sphere. If the laboratories are to be opened, then it is only for purposes of verification of compliance with the ban on the creation of offensive space weapons, and certainly not to legitimize them.

We are told of the desire to remove the fear of missiles, to secure the elimination of nuclear weapons overall. Such a wish can only be welcomed. It fully corresponds with the aims of our policy. It is, however, a lot simpler to eliminate these weapons without creating offensive space systems for this purpose. Why spend tens or hundreds of billions of dollars and pile up more mountains of space weapons along with the nuclear weapons? What is the sense in that? I asked the President, does the U.S. leadership really seriously suppose that while U.S. space weapons are being set up, we will reduce our strategic potential, and help the United States to weaken it with our own hands? It is useless to count on that. It is precisely the reverse that will happen. To restore balance the Soviet Union will be forced to raise the efficiency, precision, and might of its weapons in order to neutralize, if this is required, the electronic space machine of "star wars" being created by the Americans.

Will the Americans feel more comfortable if the echelons of space weapons planned by the U.S. is complemented in space by our weapons? People in the United States surely cannot hope that they will retain a monopoly in space. At the least, all this is not serious. However, the U.S. Administration is still not abandoning the temptation to try out the possibility of gaining military supremacy.

Right now, by venturing into an arms race in space, they intend to outpace us in electronics and computers.

But, as has been the case many times in the past, we will find a response. It will be an effective response, sufficiently quick and quite likely cheaper than the U.S. program. We also said this to the President with all clarity. [prolonged applause]

I think that new approaches are needed, a fresh look at many things and, the main thing, political will from the leadership of both countries, for a real upturn in our relations, which would serve the interests of the USSR and the United States and the interests of the peoples of the world. The USSR, and I stressed this in Geneva, does not feel emnity for the United States. It respects the American people. We do not base our policy upon a desire to encroach upon the national interests of the United States. I would say more. We, for example, would not want to change the strategic balance in our favor. We would not want this because this kind of situation will increase the suspicion of the other side and increase the instability of the overall situation. The ways things are [zhizn skladyvaetsya tak], both our countries will have to get used to strategic parity as the natural state. We will have to reach a common understanding of what level of weapons on each side could be considered relatively sufficient, from the point of view of its reliable defense. We are convinced that the level of this sufficiency is much lower than that which the USSR and United States in fact possess at the moment. And this means that weighty practical steps for the limitation and reduction of weapons are perfectly possible, measures which not only will not lessen, but strengthen security both for the USSR and the United States, and the entire strategic stability of the world.

What should I say about other matters discussed at the meeting? I will begin with the problem of regional conflicts. Both sides expressed concern over the preservation of such hot spots. This is understandable. Such conflicts are a dangerous thing, particularly given the threat of their spreading in the nuclear age. However, our attitudes to the causes and to ways of eliminating such conflicts are, one could say, not just different, but directly opposite. The United States, having become accustomed to thinking in terms of spheres of interest, reduces these problems down to rivalry between East and West. But, you know, in our times this is an anachronism, a recurrence of imperial thinking which denies the right of the majority of peoples to think and decide independently.

The deep sources of such conflicts are varied, often their roots lie in history, and mainly they lie in those social and economic conditions under which liberated countries are placed. It is not accidental, of course, when talking about the problem of regional conflicts that the United States keeps quiet about the brutalities of apartheid in the Republic of South Africa, and the aggression of that country toward its African neighbors; the war of U.S. puppets in Central America and Southeast Asia; the plundering of Israel in the Near East, and many other things. Washington attempts to put the legitimate governments of states who are advancing on the path of national liberation, social progress on the same level as counterrevolution. It is obvious that we could not accept such an interpretation.

We told the President that we are for the recognition of the inalienable right of each people for freedom and its own independent choice of the path; for this right not to be trampled on by anyone; for there to be not attempts of interference from the outside; for freedom and not tyranny to win. We have been and will remain on the side of peoples who are defending their independence. This is our principled course. [applause]

The President touched upon the question of Afghanistan. In this connection it was confirmed once more that the Soviet Union consistently advocates a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan. We are in favor of Afghanistan, our friend and neighbor, being an independent and nonaligned state. We are in favor of establishing a state of affairs which guarantees noninterference in Afghanistan's affairs and by this means, the question about the withdrawal of Soviet troops from this country will be solved. The Soviet Union and the government of Afghanistan are entirely in favor of this and if there is anyone who hinders the speedy solution of the question, then this is, above all, the United States, which finances, supports, and arms the counter-revolutionary gangs, wrecks efforts for the normalization of situation here.

Questions of bilateral relations had an important place at the talks. A certain amount of revival which has recently taken shape here has now been supported by specific agreements on exchanges and contacts in the sphere of science, education, and culture, and on the restoration of air links between our countries. But of course, it is much easier to develop to the full extent the potential founded here when the solution of questions of security, which define our mutual relations, starts. And if there is to be cooperation, then it must be equal cooperation, without any discrimination and without any preliminary conditions, without attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of the other side. Here our position is firm and consistent.

How then is one to assess the main results of the Geneva meeting? The meeting was undoubtedly a significant event. Direct, clear and specific talks are useful; the opportunity to compare positions in a well-defined manner is useful. Too many explosive and acute problems had built up. We needed to discuss these seriously and attempt to move out of the impasse.

We value the personal contact established with the U.S. President. A dialogue between top leaders is always a moment of truth in relations between states. It is important that such a dialogue has taken place. In the present difficult times it is, in itself, a stabilizing factor.

But we are realists, and we must say straight out that at the meeting we did not succeed in finding solutions for the very important questions connected with ending the arms race. The unwillingness of the U.S. leadership to give up the "star wars" program made it impossible for specific accords to be reached at Geneva on real disarmament and, primarily, on the central problem of nuclear and space armaments.

The meeting did not result in any reduction in the amount of armaments stockpiled by both sides. The arms race is continuing. This cannot but cause disappointment. The USSR and the United States are still divided by major differences on a number of other fundamental questions concerning the world situation and the development of events in individual regions.

But we are far from belittling the importance of the accords reached in Geneva. I will recall the most important of them.

There is, first and foremost, the affirmation in the joint statement of the understanding held in common that nuclear war should never be unleashed and that there can be no victor in one, and the pledge by the USSR and the United States to construct their relations on the basis of this indisputable truth and not to strive for military superiority.

We consider that this understanding, jointly affirmed at summit level, should in practice be used as the basis for the foreign policy of the two states.

As soon as it is recognized that by its very nature nuclear war cannot serve to achieve any rational aims, the stronger should be the incentive for preventing it, for ceasing the development [razrabotka] and testing of means of mass annihilation, and for the total liquidation of the stockpiles of nuclear weapons. And the more impermissible it now is to open up new directions for the arms race.

Of course, the joint statement is not a treaty. But it is a fundamental declaration of the positions of the leaders of the two countries, which imposes many obligations. The USSR and the United States also confirmed in precise terms their pledge to promote the enhancement in every possible way of the effectiveness of the regime of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, and they came to an agreement on joint practical steps in that direction.

In the current unsettled international situation this has no little significance for maintaining stability in the world, and reducing the risk of nuclear wars flaring up. The joint statement of the leaders of the two countries in favour of a comprehensive and total ban on and destruction of such a barbaric weapon of mass destruction as chemical weapons, has fundamental significance. I would like to hope that the United States in its practical policies will follow this important understanding. The accord of the leadership of the USSR and the United States to contribute jointly with other states participating in the Stockholm Conference to its early completion by adopting a document which would include both concrete obligations on the non-use of force and also mutually acceptable measures for strengthening trust, also goes far beyond the fremework of Soviet-U.S. relations. One can only welcome the fact that as a result of the meeting a number of useful accords in many areas for the development of bilateral cooperation between the USSR and the United States have appeared. I think that they will serve as a good base for raising the level of trust between our countries and peoples, if of course one takes an attitude of care to what has been worked out, and if one develops everything good that is laid down in it and does not seek artificial reasons to refute it.

Special mention must be made of the significance of the accord achieved in Geneva on the continuation of political contacts between the Soviet Union and the United States, including new meetings at summit level. And so we are right in saying that the overall balance of Geneva is a positive one. The achievement of such a promising [obnadezhivayushchiy] result undoubtedly to a decisive extent was contributed to by the constructive, consistent policy of our country. At the same time it would be unfair not to say here also that in the position of the U.S. side at the meeting, certain elements of realism came through, which contributed to the solution of a number of issues.

Of course, the real significance of everything useful that was agreed on in Geneva can only become manifest in practical deeds. In this connection I want to state that the Soviet Union for its part intends, with all determination, not to slacken the pace and in the spirit of honest cooperation with the United States, to continue its attempts to achieve a curtailment of the arms race and a general improvement in the international situation. We are counting on such an approach being manifested also by the United States.

I am sure the work carried out in Geneva will then bear real fruit. [applause]

Such is our assessment of this event and its role in international relations. I am pleased to be able to say that this assessment is shared by our allies, the fraternal socialist countries, as the meeting of the leaders of the Warsaw Pact member countries in Prague immediately after the conclusion of the Soviet-U.S. summit negotiations, bears witness with utmost clarity. The participants in the Prague meeting stressed that the situation, of course, is still not a simple one. The struggle to improve it goes on, but the conditions of this struggle -- this one can say already today -- have gotten better. The meeting in Geneva is an important link in our long-term, joint, closely coordinated efforts which aimed to secure peace.

One naturally poses the question: How does one proceed in light of the results of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue in Geneva? As I have already said, we attribute great importance to the agreements reached in Geneva on holding new Soviet-U.S. summit meetings. I would like to stress that we do not approach this matter in a formal manner. What is important is not just the fact that there will be another meeting between the leaders of the two countries: The important thing is what its results will be. The peoples will await practical progress along the path outlined in Geneva; we shall strive towards precisely this. One must start preparing even now for the next Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, first and foremost in the sphere of practical policy.

In order not to make it more difficult to attain future accords, we are convinced that both sides must first and foremost refrain from actions which undermine what has been achieved in Geneva; must refrain from actions which would block negotiations and erode the existing factors limiting the arms race. This assumes, in particular, honest and precise observance of the agreement limiting antimissile defense systems, and further mutual observance by the sides of the relevant provisions of SALT-II.

The main thing, however, is of course to create the possibility for a genuine halt to the arms race and to start practical steps to cut the stockpiled nuclear arsenals. Does such a possibility exist? We are firmly convinced that it does. It does exist. It is true that at the present time our proposals, and the U.S. ones, on reducing nuclear weapons diverge in many respects. But we do not dramatize this fact. Compromise solutions are possible here, and we are ready to seek them. There is no doubt that with a development of events such as this, questions of reliable monitoring -- in which the Soviet Union has a very direct interest -- would also be resolved. One cannot rely on words here, all the more so when it is disarmament and the country's defense which is involved.

But in order to solve all these questions it is absolutely necessary to tightly close the door through which weapons might penetrate outer space. Without this a radical reduction in nuclear armaments is impossible. I want to say this with all responsibility, on behalf of our people and its supreme body of power. [prolonged applause]

An accord is attainable if it takes into account the interests of both sides. The stubborn desire of the American side to go on with the creation [sozdaniye] of space weapons can have only one end result -- the blocking of the opportunity of ending the nuclear arms race. Naturally, such an outcome would give rise to bitter disappointment among the peoples of the whole world, including, I am sure, the American people.

Today there is a real opportunity to sharply reduce the threat of a nuclear war, and subsequently to eliminate fully the possibility of one. It would be a fatal mistake to let this opportunity pass. We hope that what was said in Geneva about the SDI is not the last word from the U.S. side.

President Reagan and I made an arrangement to instruct our delegations at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space armaments to speed up the talks and to conduct them on the basis of the January accord between the two countries. Thus, it has been reaffirmed by both sides at summit level: An arms race in outer space must be prevented by tackling this question in conjunction with a reduction of nuclear armaments. This is precisely what the Soviet Union will be striving for, and this is precisely what we are urging the United States to emulate. By fulfilling in practice the commitments we have jointly undertaken, we will justify the hopes of the peoples of the whole world. [prolonged applause]

The longer it goes on, the more acute becomes the question of ending nuclear tests, first and foremost because an end would be made to the creation [sozdaniye] of new and the perfection of existing types of nuclear weapons. Because, further, without tests, without modernization, the process of the dying out of nuclear arsenals and the phasing out of nuclear weapons would gradually proceed. Because, finally, it can no longer be permitted that nuclear explosions -- they have amounted to hundreds -- disfigure our beautiful earth, swelling the alarm as to how future generations will live. That is why the Soviet Union announced its moratorium on all types of nuclear tests through 1 January 1986 and is prepared to extend this moratorium if there is reciprocity from the U.S. side.

We await from the U.S. leadership a concrete and positive decision which would have a very favorable effect on the whole situation, which would in many ways change it and would strengthen trust between our countries. We asked this question of the U.S. President in Geneva. The answer was silence. In reality, there are no reasonable arguments against banning nuclear tests. In fact, there are no arguments at all. Sometimes reference is made to the difficulties of monitoring. But the Soviet Union has clearly demonstrated the total possibility of the implementation of such monitoring by means of national facilities. This year we detected an underground nuclear explosion of extremely small capacity carried out by the United States and not announced by it. We are ready also to examine the possibility of setting up international monitoring. Deserving attention in this connection are the considerations submitted in the message from six states proposing the creation on their territories of special stations for observing the fulfillment of an agreement on halting tests.

The whole world is raising its voice in favor of halting nuclear tests. At the UN General Assembly a resolution has just been passed calling for such a halt. Only three countries, the United States, Britain, and France, voted against it. This is worthy of deep regret.

But there is still time. I think that the leaders of the United States and the other nuclear powers will take the opportunity which has opened up, proceeding from the interests of peace, and will display the necessary responsibility. I should like to recall that our moratorium remains in force and we hope that the discussion of this question at the USSR Supreme Soviet will be assessed as an urgent appeal for a realistic and immediate ban on all nuclear tests.

Altogether, the Soviet Union proposes an all-embracing complex of measures which would block all the roads of the arms race, whether in space or on earth, whether in nuclear, chemical, or conventional weapons. The specific proposals in this respect are known in Vienna, in Geneva, and in Stockholm. They remain in force and retain all their topicality.

Europe should be mentioned separately. The task of preventing the further raising of the level of military confrontation is more acute here than ever before. The European house is a house in common, where geography and history have closely interlinked the fates of dozens of countries and their peoples. The Europeans can only preserve their house and make it better and safer by collective efforts, following the sensible standards of international intercourse and co-operation. We proceed on the basis that Europe, which has given so much to the world in the fields of culture, science, technology, and progressive social thought, is capable of setting an example also in solving the highly complex problems of contemporary international life. The foundations for this were laid 10 years ago in Helsinki. In the final analysis, we are most deeply convinced that the whole world, including the United States of America, will gain from the positive development of the situation in Europe. We have been working and shall continue to work for the more energetic consolidation on the long-suffering European Continent of the principles and policy of detente, for overcoming the obstructions of the past and the consequences of the confrontation of recent years.

I would like to make particular mention here of commercial and economic relations. The business circles of many countries of the West would like to make wider economic contacts with us. I have heard from very influential representatives of these circles about this, of the readiness for large-scale contracts and readiness to begin large joint projects. And in my opinion, those politicians who try to put limitations on this natural desire for business cooperation, in the hope of "punishing" someone and doing damage to the other party are simple illogical. Such a policy long ago had its day. It is much more useful to employ one's efforts toward something else, with the aim of enabling commercial, scientific, and technical exchanges to strengthen the material basis of agreement and trust.

In the struggle for lasting [prochnyy] peace and cooperation between peoples in Europe and other continents, we shall continue to cooperate closely with our allies in the Warsaw Pact and with all the countries of the socialist community. The Warsaw Pact member states will never, under any circumstances, compromise the security of their peoples. To an increasing extent, they will also join their efforts within the framework of the CEMA with the aim of speeding up scientific and technical progress and socioeconomic development. Cooperation with the Nonaligned Movement, including all-round cooperation with the Republic of India, is of tremendous significance in making international relations more healthy. [applause]

The Soviet leadership attaches serious significance to the Asian-Pacific area. The Soviet Union's longest borders are in Asia. There we have both true friends and reliable allies, from neighboring Mongolia to socialist Vietnam. It is extremely important to ensure that this area does not become a source of tension, a sphere of military confrontation. We are in favor of broadening political dialogue between all the states situated there, in the interests of peace, good-neighborliness, mutual trust, and cooperation. We welcome the position of the PRC opposing the militarization of space as well as its statement refusing to make use of nuclear weapons.

We are in favor of improving relations with Japan. We are confident that this is a real possibility. It stems from the simple fact alone that our countries are immediate neighbors. In removing the nuclear threat, in this fundamental issue, the interests of the USSR and Japan cannot but coincide.

We have established relations of equal cooperation with many states of Latin America, Africa, and the Near East. The Soviet Union will continue to work purposefully on developing these relations. We particularly value the close ties we have established with countries of a socialist orientation situated on various continents. Today, the peoples of the whole world are faced with a multiplicity of issues, such as can only be resolved jointly and only under conditions of peace.

Just a few decades ago, people did have virtually no serious ecological problems. But our generation has been witness to the mass destruction of forests, disappearance of animals, pollution of rivers and lakes, broadening of desert zones -- and what kind of world will future generations see? Will they be able to live in it if we do not stop the predatory destruction of nature, if the economic, technical, and scientific achievements of our age are turned not to the needs of securing conditions for the existence and development of man, of the environment in which he dwells, but to perfecting the instruments of annihilation?

Or take the sphere of energy; so far we are living mainly on the resources of the bowels of the earth. But, what was deposited near the surface is being exhausted and their further use is becoming more and more expensive and more and more difficult, and this is not an endless source.

The growing gap between the handful of highly-developed capitalist countries and those developing countries -- and they are the vast majority -- whose fate is poverty, famine and hopelessness also contains the seeds of dangerous upheavals. The gulf between those two world poles is becoming ever wider and the relations more and more antagonistic. They cannot be any other unless the developed capitalist countries change their egoistic policies.

The resolution of all these problems is within the powers of mankind today if its efforts and intellect are joined. New heights in the development of civilization will then be accessible. Militarism is hostile to the peoples; the arms race, which is whipped up by the thirst for profit by the military-industrial complex, is reckless. It strikes at the vitally important interests of all countries and peoples. This is why, when it is proposed to us that instead of destroying nuclear weapons we should spread the arms race to space as well, we say firmly: No. We say no because that step would mark a new and senseless waste of means. We say no because this means increasing the danger hanging over the world. We say no because life itself requires not a contest in weapons, but joint action for the good of the world. The Soviet Union is a resolute supporter of the development of international life in this direction. [applause]

At the initiative of the USSR, and with the participation of scientists from various countries, development has begun of the Tokamak thermonuclear reactor project, which opens up the opportunity of a radical solution to the energy problem. According to the scientists it is possible even this century to create a "sun on earth" [zemnoye solntse], an inexhaustible source of thermonuclear energy. We note with satisfaction that it was agreed in Geneva to continue this important work.

Our country has put forward for examination at the United Nations an extensive program for peaceful cooperation in space, for the creation of a world space organization which would coordinate the efforts of countries in researching the assimilation of space. The possibilities for this are truly inexhaustible. There are fundamental scientific research and use of the results in the fields of geology, medicine, materials technology [materialovedeniye], the study of climates and the natural environment. These are the creation of a global satellite communications system, remote probing of the earth. These are finally, the creation and use of, in the interests of all peoples, new space technology, including big scientific orbital stations, various manned craft, and, in the long term, the industrialization of near-earth space. This is a real alternative to the "star wars" plans aimed at a peaceful future for all mankind. The Soviet Union came forward as one of the active participants in concluding an international convention on a system for the economic use of the resources of the world's oceans. The resolution of this task is also of great significance for securing progress in human civilization and for expanding and multiplying the capacities at the disposal of contemporary society.

We propose to the whole world, including the world of the capitalist states, a wide, long-term and comprehensive program of mutually advantageous cooperation, bearing in mind those new opportunities which are opened for mankind by the era of the scientific and technical revolution. And in implementing this program the cooperation of two states such as the Soviet Union and the United States of America could play a far from minor role.

Our policy is clear. It is a policy of peace and cooperation. Comrades, the sources of the success of our foreign policy are in the internal nature of the socialist system. The Communist Party is well aware of and greatly values the support of the whole people for its domestic and foreign policy. This support is seen in the daily practical work of millions and millions. The results achieved in the economy are not just economic, but a most important moral and political result, showing the correctness of the course we have taken. Ahead of us are important and difficult matters. "But difficult," as the great Lenin taught, "is not the same as unrealizable. Certainty in the correctness of choice of roads is important, and this certainty increases revolutionary energy and revolutionary enthusiasm a hundredfold. This certainty, which multipies our strength, exists in the party and in the Soviet people." [prolonged applause]

We are sure that every Communist, every worker, every peasant, every engineer and scientist, every labor collective will fulfill their duty with an awareness of their great responsibility to the homeland. We are sure that at every workplace everything will be done so that the plans for 1986 will be successfully fulfilled and overfulfilled, so that our country becomes even more wealthy and mighty, and the cause of peace on earth becomes stronger and triumphs. [tumultuous, prolonged applause]

TV PROGRAM EXAMINES SCIENTIFIC-TECHNICAL PROGRESS

LD302116 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1600 GMT 29 Nov 85

["Problems, Searches, Solutions" phone-in program presented by political observer L. Voznesenskiy, with Academician Anatoliy Petrovich Aleksandrov, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, chairman of the Bureau for Machine Building of the USSR Council of Ministers and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Yevgeniy Pavlovich Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Ivan Semenovich Nayashkov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Inventions and Discoveries; Academician Yuriy Antoliyevich Ovchinnikov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and Guriy Ivanovich Marchuk, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology -- live]

[Text] [Voznesenskiy] Hello, comrades! We are beginning our latest broadcast in the series "Problems, Searches, Solutions". This is the first broadcast in the series in connection with the discussion of the party's precongress documents: the drafts of the new edition of the CPSU Program, of its statutes with the changes being proposed, of the basic guidelines for the economic and social development of the USSR for 1986-90 and up to the year 2000.

Each discussion presupposes not only questions and answers, but also remarks and proposals. And you have the opportunity to set them out by telephone and in writing after the broadcast.

Today we are proposing that fundamental issues of our social and economic development, the fundamental issue of the party's economic strategy, namely the question of speeding up scientific and technical progress, should be discussed.

Taing part in this broadcast are: Academician Antoliy Petrovich Aleksandrov, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, chairman of the Bureau for Machine Building of the USSR Council of Ministers and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Yevgeniy Pavlovich Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, an academician of course; Ivan Semonovich Nayashkov, chairman of the USSR State Committeee for Inventions and Discoveries; Academician Yuriy Anatoliyevich Ovchinnikov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Guriy Ivanovich Marchuk, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, an academician.

We are waiting for your questions, comrades, by telephone on the numbers which have now appeared on your screens. And while you write them down, I shall say that taking your wishes into account, expressed in a number of letters, one of the telephone lines was linked to the editorial room beforehand and its number was published in the weekly GOVORIT I POKAZYVAYET MOSKVA. A number of comrades have made use of this telephone and dictated their questions into it. Let us start with these questions which were phoned in on this line.

Nikolay Vasilyevich Afanasyev from the town of (Pripet), Kiev Oblast, would like to hear Anatoliy Petrovich Aleksandrov's answers to four questions at once. Well, I think if one were to reply to all four questions it probably would take a very long time. But, perhaps the first two questions could be answered at the start of the broadcast. Anatoliy Petrovich?

[Aleksandrov] The materials of the 25th and 26th CPSU congresses spoke about mastering fast reactors and channelling reactors [kanalnyye reaktory] with a capacity of 2,000 megawatts and more. How are things going with this question? Where is it proposed to build them?

Well, this is a fairly simple question. The fact is that in our country the capacity of power generating sets of atomic stations is gradually being increased, both fast neutron atomic stations and thermonuclear atomic stations. At present the maximum capacity of a power generating set reached by us is 1.5 million kilowatts, and not 2 million as indicated in the letter here. And the first two sets of the Ignalina atomic station have been put into operation. On the basis of the results of their work -- true, they have not been operating long; we have not yet accumulated very much experience -- but we have already found it possible to build the next series of large reactors precisely of this capacity. So, this series will be developed. Designs for reactors of 2,000 megawatt and more are being drawn up and a design for a 2,400 megawatt steam superheat reactor has even been drawn up. But it has not yet been finally decided where they will be built. The fact is that, given our electric power system, 2 million kilowatts in one reactor is a somewhat large capacity. Because, in the event of it being suddenly switched off, there would be a big jolt throughout the electric power system. It is exactly for this reason that we are not in a hurry to put into operation these reactions of a big capacities, compared with the scale of our system today. The optimum capacity for us today is precisely 1-1.5 million kilowatts.

Second question, Why is there a duplication of designs taking place? For instance, the power generating sets at Leningrad, Ignalina and Chernobyl are of the same type but were built on the basis of five different projects, each of which has shortcomings. Would it not be better to pool efforts and draw up one good design?

I think that Comrade Afanasyev is absolutely right. And it is indeed better to have a single design on the basis of which one needs to build. But one should not forget that this is a very rapidly developing field and, therefore, improvements are being made fairly quickly. But receiving any innovation [razrabotka] which is more advanced that the one being used, of course, always very advantageous and it is a good thing to use it. It is this which is leading to these changes in the design which are now being introduced. But as a whole, of course, we are seeking to standardize more, to carry through more standardization of designs, and this is one of the sectors of our planning activity which I believe to be important. The third question...

[Voznesenskiy interrupts] You can answer questions three and four a bit later, because I see that it has something in common with the questions of other comrades.

[Aleksandrov] Agreed.

[Voznesenskiy] Thank you. Comrade Chrikov asks: Why do the basic guidelines say that machine building is the key to scientific and technical progress? What about electronics, chemistry, and other industries? It is really the case that nothing depends on them? Perhaps Ivan Stepanovich will speak about the role of machine building, compared with other progressive trends in the development of science and technology?

[Silayev] Well, first of all, the basic guidelines set down very clearly the task of electronics. And Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, in his address in June at the conference called electronics the catalyst of technical progress. That is to say the leading role of electronics, this sector in machinebuilding, has already been determined. It is very important that precise tasks have been set here also in the sphere of new materials. And chemistry, as is known, is becoming increasingly important in the creation of new materials, not metals, but plastics, composites. In short, the basic guidelines clearly set down the tasks of the whole of machinebuilding. This is in the first place, the machine-tool industry, instrument making, electric engineering and electronics, and the specific tasks are set also for all kinds of materials, especially the latest materials, including also for chemistry...

[Aleksandrov, interrupting] Fertilizers, also, and other...

[Silayev] Yes... well, the role of machine building and why it is perceived to be important. We are facing the task of radically reequipping the whole of our national economy, of supplying our main industries with highly productive machinery. Such machinery is made in machinebuilding. It is natural therefore that the role of the complex of machinebuilding industries is very important.

[Voznesenskiy] Thus, the leading role of machinebuilding in tackling problems of scientific and technical progress does not abrogate the especially important role of a number of other industries in the national economy, including not only those which are found inside machinebuilding as a complex but also (of those) which strictly speaking go beyond its confines?

[Silayev] Absolutely correct!

[Voznesenskiy] Good! Thank you! Yura Lisitsyn, a pupil from Vladimir, asks: The draft speaks of personal computers. What are they and what are they needed for? If they are used, people will forget how to count and think altogether. Is this a good thing, Yevgeniy Pavlovich?

[Velikhov] Well, frankly, if they forget how to count, I think this would be a bad thing. But a personal computer is a computing system, which, thanks to progress in microelectronics and computer engineering, can today help every person both to count and, most importantly, to think. For this reason it is important how to use it correctly. For man has not stopped moving about as a result of the appearance of the car. He can now travel a distance of hundreds of kilometers, and in aircraft thousands of kilometers. The same is true of the telephone. [as heard] What then about the computers? It broadens all possibilities for man's thinking activity. And what has been made by man has in the final analysis, first of all, been made by his brain. Therefore every one who thinks will in time need a personal computer and present-day technology gives him this possibility.

[Voznesenskiy] Thank you. Yuriy Nikolayevich Shatayev, a higher school teacher, asks: From the practical invention to its introduction, he writes, it takes over 12 years. What measures are being planned to shorten this time? I don't very much believe that this question strictly relates to you, Ivan Semenovich. But perhaps you will make your contribution to the reply to such a question.

[Nayashkov] Indeed, Lev Aleksandrovich, the times are somewhat different. According to the statistics of the past few years, in our country the time needed on average to bring an invention to life in new equipment is approximately half of what was mentioned by the comrade. And as to shortening this time -- 5, 6 years is of course not a short space of time, let us say even that today it is a long time. This time is necessary to activate the possibilities for planning new equipment, and perhaps not even the possibilities for planning, but to raise the active role of the plan and to raise the interest of the collectives of enterprises and not only of the inventors -- as the mechanism of technical progress and inventiveness in our country operates more in that direction -- and to create the conditions for getting collectives interested. By the way, availing myself of this opportunity, I wish to tell you that we are now preparing a draft law and we have set ourselves this task. It is so far difficult to say how it will turn out. We are now seeking advice from the ministries about the search for the best solution of this task. But we believe that the law should solve the task of creating the conditions for getting the collectives of enterprises interested in the soonest possible utilization of inventions, what our comrade's question was about.

[Vozensenskiy] Ivan Semenovich, the question of Comrade Sinyukhin from Kiev, could seemingly be somewhere connected up with your story. The point about the introduction of innovations in production needs to be entered without fail in the basic guidelines or even in the CPSU program. At present by the time a new idea sees the light of day it will no longer be new. Without the solving of these issues no progress is possible. I think that your reply opens up a certain prospect for solving these problems.

[Nayashkov] I can add to this that at the committee we have already received lots of proposals from inventors which precisely propose that this idea should be implemented and included in the up-date of the draft program. We are getting ready for this.

[Voznesenskiy] Thank you! Yuriy Anatolyevich, so far not a single question has come in connected with agriculture, biology. But no, there has actually been one. Here we are. [laughs] It has been brought in. I'll read it in a minute.

But, as I started another subject, I wanted to say, that you are not only the leader of one of the most important sectors in science, but, apart from everything else, you are also the director of one of the biggest academic institutes. And, in connection with this, I would like to ask a question on behalf of Leonid Vasilyevich Kozlov, who poses the question very forcefully. It is known that high-handed administration is causing great damage to the development of science. What is being done for the democratization of scientific life, for raising the role of scientific councils and overcoming, as it is put here, the cult of the director which has become the practice in a number of scientific institutions. I quote word for word as this was dictated.

[Ocvhinnikov] Well, I think that...first of all that democracy is fairly widespread because, all the same, the main decisions are being taken by a collective of scientists, a scientific council. And it seems to me that such a collegial organ, be it an institute or the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences, makes it possible to take optimum decisions fairly correctly and to select fairly correctly some path or other in the development of science. But, you understand, the strenuous work now being done in scientific institutions also requires a certain discipline. Because one can of course not deny the fact that many sub-units of many academic institutes, and only of academic ones, are not operating all that effectively and it is the task of the director, of the administration, of course, to see to it that an institute should be operating fruitfully.

I think that there is no contradiction here. At present the powers of the director of an institute are being broadened. In particular, the latest decisions which were taken by our government offer considerably more opportunities for the director of an institute to influence the development of some sectors or other. Well, as a rule, the directors of scientific research institutions are major scientists, major specialists, whom we trust, and together with the collective, together with the public organizations, I think optimum correct solutions can always be found. It seems to be that we have all possibilities to overcome these negative features which are connected with high-handed administration.

[Voznesenskiy] Well, what is being done is that, apart from everything else, the law on labour collectives and the raising of their role in the management of enterprises, institutions, and organizations is giving certain rights to a labor collective also in scientific institutions. Is that not so? And, obviously, a realistic mechanism needs to be worked out which would make it possible to reveal more fully the possibilities of this initiative of the collective and would lay down a rise in the responsibilities both of the managers and of the collective itself.

While you were telling us of this administrative side of the matter an entire bundle of questions addressed to you have come in. And I, having begged Guriy Ivanovich's pardon for somewhat delaying the start of his reply, I wish to ask you all the same a question which has come in from Tashkent from Comrade Irgashev; What real measures are being taken now in order to use the successes of biotechnology and genetic engineering in agriculture for their development in the country? Well, it goes without saying, could you be as brief as possible, although I understand that the question is too wide-ranging.

[Ovchinnikov] Lev Aleksandrovich, first of all in the last few years the USSR Academy of Sciences itself has considerably expanded its work in the sphere of agricultural subject-matter. Many of our frontranking biological institutes have started to become directly involved in such matters as the utilization of the most up-to-date methods for evolving new varieties of plants or breeds of animals, for obtaining feeds, etc. And we think that this line will be continued in a highly intensive way.

Secondly, we have expanded in earnest our ties with the Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences (VASKhNiL). At present we have essentially formed a single complex and found the right organizational forms for our joint work.

And finally, thirdly, we are now thinking, and by the way an appropriate decision exists, of organizing biotechnological centers in a number of agricultural regions, the main agricultural regions in our country. These centers will be led by the Academy of Sciences and VaskhNiL in such a way that the most advanced achievements of biological thought should be transformed directly already in some practical tasks. Practical research in the interests of agricultural production. And, summing all this up, I would like to stress that today all biological scientists in our country regard the questions of the solving of the food program as one of the most important sectors of our activity. Taking into account that there are very interesting and complicated fundamental problems here and, of course, the immune topicality of these questions for our country.

[Voznesenskiy] We do not have social scientists in the strict sense of the word present among us today if you exclude me. I am here in a different role. [laughs] Nevertheless it seems to me that a question which was phoned in by Professor Sergey Nikolayevich Plotnikov is one which we can all identify with: The new edition of the party program and a number of speeches by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev have lent support to the importance of the human factor and the social aspects of our country's development. What ways are envisaged for developing sociological science further in our country, and in particular creating an all-union sociological service or an all-union social development service? Does the leadership of the academy have any thoughts on this subject, Anatoliy Petrovich?

[Aleksandrov] Well, this is of course a very serious question and it calls for more than just a brief answer: a very detailed discussion is required. But the following must be said before all. Recently, it could be frequently observed in our country that there is a certain lack of synchronization between the development of technology and meeting the social needs of working people, of families, of new families being set up at new construction sites, or of children. There have frequently been complaints at the lack of the necessary number of places at kindergartens, at the lack of school premises; schools have had to work a three-shift system. And now the Central Committee has set the task of stepping up attention to meeting more broadly the requirements of working people at all of our country's major construction sites -- their requirements for housing, for hospitals, children's homes, and kindergartens of all kinds, as well as cultural centers, movie theaters, clubs, and so on -- the construction of which has been slowed down somewhat by us recently.

This will, of course, create more stable collectives; it will have an influence on the creation of patriots at every such new center, every new town or settlement, committed to their home town; it will create stability in collectives and will, of course, lead to a substantial increase in the yield of public-sector work.

[Voznesenskiy] And evidently, Anatoliy Petrovich, there is great importance here in the role of sociologists above all -- they must come up with the relevant forecasts, they must follow the real progress of the process of the development, the satisfaction of the needs of working people, and more than that, send signals in good time to management bodies concerning not only trouble which has already arisen in this area, but trouble which can be forecast.

[Aleksandrov] And that enhancement of the role played by party and trade union organizations which has been defined recently by all the latest decisions will, I think, play an enormous part in this.

[Voznesenskiy] And the last thing that it is probably a good idea to recall is that now, when the remote, little-populated, and climatically harsh regions are being opened up, this problem assumes particular importance for those regions. This was, as we all well remember, vividly stressed during Mikhail Sergeyevich's visit to Tyumen.

[Aleksandrov] Quite right, quite right.

[Marchuk] There's something I would like to add. I fully agree with you and with the ideas that you, Anatoliy Petrovich, put forward, but there is yet another aspect which seems to me very important. Scientific and technological progress is starting; it is developing rapidly. And in an age of scientific and technological progress we must train the people who are capable of accepting that progress, of taking an active part in it and, in fact, being the people who create things by working on the problems of scientific and technological progress. That is why an enormous army of scientists is involved in this, including sociologists and philosophers, because the shaping of the personality in the age of scientific and technological progress is a problem that is now just starting, but it is one of extreme importance. There are many things in our country that are not proceeding at the right pace, at the right speed, and this is not only because we don't have sufficient equipment, technology, or the scientific foundations but also because people have not been made ready to accept them. It was with this very aim, therefore, that the Central Committee and the Soviet Government took the decision to reform the general education schools. That was the first stage. Work is now in progress to perfect higher education. To sum up, in the age of scientific and technological progress we must all go on learning continuously, otherwise we will fall behind.

[Silayev] May I speak? Since this is an important question, I should like to add that the social problem there, for example, housing, kindergartens, and other public centers at works and enterprises, is today not simply a consumer-type relationship between the people who need things and the state. With the new system of economic incentives and with enterprises operating under the new system, it becomes possible for them to take part themselves in solving social problems. Works are getting the opportunity, when they do good work and get good results, to set up their own fund which will not be taken away from them. The works collective is able to determine for itself where the money should be channelled, and of course it will be channelled into solving these social problems. And the better the enterprise operates, the more money it earns to solve its basic social problems.

[Voznesenskiy] Anatoliy Petrovich wanted to add a few words.

[Aleksandrov] Yes, I wanted to add a little something by way of an example. We are now engaged -- every one of us, in fact -- in expanding the use of computer technology in our schools, higher educational establishments, scientific establishments, and so on. Only yesterday I passed on to Velikhov a draft project for setting up a special laboratory attached to the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, to our academy, and to the Academy of Medical Sciences, which is to monitor how our younger generation in the schools accepts this computer technology and whether it will do any harm to any aspects of their development. That, for example, is another of the ways that we want to solve a very important social question, because what we need now is a universal mastery of computer technology in our country, at least among the young people.

[Voznesenskiy] The problem of man and machine is an extraordinarily varied one, and we are constantly coming up against it in real life. But here is a perhaps slightly surprising question in the context of conditions in our country. Nevertheless, it has been asked. For you, Guriy Ivanovich. Vladimir Petrovich Karatyanko, a pensioner, asks: On the subject of robotization, how will this affect the employment of workers in production? Is this issue being thought about to ensure that there is no unemployment?

[Marchuk] Well, of course! I think that Ivan Stepanovich might be able to say more here, but since you have asked me, I shall give you my point of view. Of course robotization is an element which in the final analysis alters the technology of machine building whereby separate processes are turned by means of a robot and conveying equipment into a unified production process. It becomes more stable and produces better quality and more reliable output because a machine is operating there according to a program. With the human factor, when the man transfers from one operation to another, the figures fall sharply. On the other hand, however, the nature of the work also changes. What will now be needed is not the unskilled worker, but a worker-technologist, a worker-designer, who will sit working at a console, who will control the system, and who will create the programs which will in the future run this whole system of continuous processes. In a word, a place will always be found for people, and the work done by people in this age, so to speak, of robotization and flexible, adaptable production systems will be more interesting, more gratifying and -- which is the most important -- more productive.

[Voznesenskiy] A question has come in for which, I think, two of our esteemed guests will have to give an answer: Yevgeniy Pavlovich and Yuriy Anatoliyevich. It's from postal-telecommunications worker Aleksey Mikhaylovich Morozov. "When is it expected that biological materials will be used to build computers throughout the world?" Aleksey Mikhaylovich asks.

[Velikohov] There are two aspects here: one technological, and the other fundamental. The fundamental aspect lies in the fact that the development of computer technology today is moving in a direction that differs considerably from how we all think our brain works. In certain things, for example to carry out simple operations of adding and subtracting, today's supercomputer can do the work of millions of people. But on the other hand, if you look at how our eye processes information, then you need thousands of such computers to match that speed. So an understanding of how the process of thought takes place can have a still greater effect than simply using biological materials. But on the other hand, many biological materials are even today becoming interesting. Certain dyestuffs, for example, can be memory elements, and so on. There is another interesting aspect, which is that in biology there is the most well-organized process of growth.

Today we electronics people and the biologists have got down to approximately the same dimensions: microns and fractions of a micron. What has come about is a sort of synergism, so to speak, whereby it is in the microworld that we are looking for the solution to the processes of life, thought, development and so forth. So there will probably be a meeting point here, too, between many questions. Of course it would be a good idea to grow computers in the same way that we grow mushrooms, for example, or plants. That would be fine, but we are still a long way off from that.

[Ovchinnikov] I agree with Yevgeniy Pavlovich that, as I think, the development of computer technology is proceeding in an optimum way. We are learning a lot about how, for example, information processing takes place ina living organism. But I think that for us now to put our stakes on this sort of approach it would be a little early. In particular, there is this example. An organism uses living, primarily chemical, methods for recording and implementing information. In other words, large molecules -- for example DNA molecules -- enable colossal amounts of information to be recorded and implemented quite rapidly, but it is very difficult to approach the question of how to translate this into some sort of practical devices. That question we are still studying. On the other hand you mentioned, Yevgeniy Pavlovich, the human eye. There are now a number of materials which occur in microorganisms and which have similar structure and properties to the materials in a human or an animal eye -- the so-called retinene-containing protein derivatives. When the wavelength of the incident light changes -- in other words when the light is modulated -- they change color, and such systems are already now starting to be used successfully in particular in holographic devices. I am engaged in joint work on this in particular with Academician Prokhorov. I think that such an approach is extremely promising, and work on it is in hand.

[Voznesenskiy] Post-graduate student Anatoliy Andreyevich would like to know what are the chief functions of the USSR Council of Ministers' bureau on maching building. And engineer Valeriy Ivanovich Komlev, who works at a machine building plant, asks the following question, Ivan Stepanovich: "Please could you explain about the setting up of the bureau on machine building? Won't it be a superstructure in the form of a huge ministry?

[Silayev] I should like to begin my answer to those questions - and very correct ones they are too, of course, by quoting the first few lines of the section "Machine Building Complex" in the draft program. Here it says that as a matter of priority there is to be a radical reconstruction and advanced development of the machine building complex, first and foremost machine tool building, the production of computer equipment, instrument building, and the electrical engineering and electronics industry, and that there is to be an advanced rate of growth in output by those sectors 50 percent greater than the average for machine building as a whole. In other words, we have the colossal task of providing the country witha large quantity of the most perfect means of production. That requires, among other things, a corresponding organizational restructuring. Unfortunately in our country today there are instances of lack of coordination between departments, and the bureau is aimed at coordinating this work and eliminating the need for these points of contact. Everything in machine building will be in the hands, so to speak, under the control of the bureau of machine building. In addition to that, these sectors are being allocated very large capital investment in order to increase their production, to enable the basic problems of machine building to be solved within a short period. And also the correct management of those funds, distributing them correctly and organizing the work to create those capacities -- that is also an important question, a very serious task which, of course, requires coordinated action. There are, too, several other problems related directly to the joint work of the machine building sectors.

As for the question as to whether it might be a very large superstructure on top of the ministry, I should in fact like to recall that the organization and management of these sectors is now being restructured in a different direction. Individual sections are, on the contrary, being cut back and greater opportunities and independence are being granted to industrial enterprises; in other words a very large number of such superstructures that used to hinder work are being eliminated. They are being replaced by a very small working apparatus which I have no doubt will cope with the very serious tasks and will justify its appointment and existence.

[Voznesenskiy] I think that your reply, Ivan Stepanovich, also partially answers a question that has come in from Petr Prokhorovich Melnits, an engineer from Tallinn: "How can the departmental barrier be overcome?" That is one of the ways of overcoming the lack of corrdination between departments, and in this respect we can see certain promise not only in the example of the bureau, but also in the example of machine building and in the setting of the agro-industrial complex. And we will hope, so to speak, that these measures, combined with other measures that are being taken to improve the management system, will help us overcome this really chronic and very serious evil.

[Silayev] Quite right.

[Voznesenskiy] Several questions, I would even say many questions, have come in for Guriy Ivanovich. Engineer Igor Nikolayevich Goralov asks him to speak about the enhancement of the prestige of engineering work and what is specifically being done in this direction.

[Marchuk] Well, of course, in the age of scientific and technological progress, and particularly when its importance is being enhanced, the role played by the engineer, the designer and the technologists is also enhanced. And this is not a simple problem, it is one that has many different levels. One of the most important decisions that has been issued recently, perhaps a year ago, was the new system of wages payment for engineers, technologists and designers at enterprises. We all know that this experiment is proceeding very successfully in Leningrad at several enterprises, and it must be said that it has been warmly approved and supported by many design and technological bureaus, and we can now say that the finishing touches are already being put to a more or less general mechanism for measuring engineering labor and the work of technologists and designers, and for correspondingly evaluating and providing a wage for it. In addition I think it is very important that the Central Committee and the government have recently adopted the decision to introduce the honorary titles of "merited technologist" and "merited engineer". That too is a recognition of the prestige of that work. I think that the engineer today should also put himself forward in the following capacity. He should be the carrier of new fundamental ideas for equipment and technology. And it is those engineers who involve themselves soonest in this innovation and who start to tackle the problems of a priority nature on every level of their activity that should receive particular gratitude from the collective and, ultimately, from society. To sum up, it seems to me that an intensive economy puts forward special demands on that section of people that will put it into practice in the final stage. Here there are many opportunities, and I think that the forthcoming 5-year plan period will open up still more paths for enhancing the prestige of those professions.

[Voznesenskiy] Guriy Ivanovich, perhaps to that very important list of circumstances that you have described it is worth adding, if I am not mistaken, at least one more. That is that we probably have to create the organizational conditions at plants and in offices where engineering labor is used whereby the engineer carries out properly engineering functions.

Because -- and let's be open about it -- there are often people working in our country under the title of engineer whose work, strictly speaking, is essentially not of an engineering nature, and this somehow blurs the very concept of an engineer and, since we are talking of prestige, it undermines the prestige of this naturally very high-ranking and responsible title in society and in general, and in the age of scientific and technological revolution -- not to mention a period of utmost acceleration of scientific and technological progress and intensification of production -- in particular.

[Marchuk] You are absolutely right. That problem does of course exist, and it is a very serious one.

[Voznesenskiy] Ivan Semenovich, engineer Ivanov asks: "When will an organization be set up to accept promising innovations and inventions from all citizens who wish to offer them?"

[Nayashkov] That is the most complicated and difficult question that I could have counted on, because the question is - when? For the time being we cannot specify any time scale, but what we are now working on, Lev Aleksandrovich, is to set up an organization attached to the Committee for Inventions and Discoveries which could help first and foremost inventors working, firstly, even at secondary schools, at technical colleges, at vocational education schools, and students at higher educational establishments who, having essentially no experimental base to hand but being infected with the virus -- in quotation marks -- of technical creativity, now and then create original and interesting technical designs. Sometimes they may not be very intricate ones, but they do contain the germ of the future talent which, if it is nurtured, may grow into major and rich fruit in this respect. And we think that in the next few years, and we already have the agreement of the State Planning Committee and are now holding talks with a number of republics, we will set up such an organization attached to the committee and try, on the model of one or two other organizations, to assist the procedure of approving and checking bold and interesting engineering inventions.

[Voznesenskiy] Anatoliy Petrovich, Mikhail Borisovich Pospelov, a building engineer from the Ministry of Installation and Special Construction Work, asks how things stand with the problem of turning the northern rivers south. This is a problem that concerns our fellow countrymen, he writes.

[Aleksandrov] I think that this problem concerns not just our fellow countrymen but all of us who are sitting here! The fact is that there are two sides here. On the one hand there is a shortage of water resources in the south of our country -- local rivers and springs -- in order to carry out agriculture at the proper level, in order to get the proper yield and so on. In order for this defect to be removed proposals were made on diverting part of the flow of the northern rivers and part of the flow of the Siberian rivers to the south in order to eliminate this deficit. However, this is a very complex task. It is complex both from the technical point of view -- because this is an enormous structure, and a very expensive one -- and it is also complex from the scientific point of view, because it is very difficult to predict in detail all the changes that might be brought about as a result of diverting the flows of rivers in such a way. For example, the Academy of Sciences gave its agreement or recommendation, if you prefer, to divert a small amount of flow about six cubic kilometers per annum , from the flow of the northern rivers. [indistinct interjection from another participant] Yes. And to transfer this to the south, thereby increasing the flow in the Volga and thereby transforming the area of ours beyond the Volga which in general is arid into a stable grain-producing base. We consider that this first step is quite safe and will only lead to great advantage.

On the other hand we laid down the restriction, that this diversion must on no account lead to a lowering of the outflow towards the Onega-Ladoga Lake and the River Neva, because if a part of the water were taken away from there then there could be a threat of the Neva being turned into a swamp near Leningrad where it goes into the Gulf of Finland.

[Ovchinnikov] Anatoliy Petrovich, we also made it a condition that monuments of Russian antiquity should not suffer: and that promise was given to us.

[Aleksandrov] That was simply because the decision was such a small one, 6 cubic kilometers, and therefore it was possible not to infringe upon anything. Now, as far as further increasing the amount diverted is concerned, here we required a very detailed project to be worked out in order for it to be possible to assess all the consequences. However, we know and our experience shows, that we have the Kara Kum canal, you understand. We have other major irrigation works and land improvement works involving water of this kind which have brought us great profit. So we must not forget that, too. Now, as a rule, if you ask one of our Siberian scientists, he will be against diverting the flow of Siberian rivers to the south. But if you ask someone from Tajikistan or Uzbekistan, he will be in favor.

[Voznesenskiy] And no doubt each of them will back up his view with substantial scientific arguments.

[Aleksandrov] Of course. So, it is a very complicated question. We are dealing with it and will do so and, of course, a carefully weighed and sensible approach is needed here.

[Voznesenskiy] An approach that is primarily the approach of the national economy, of the state.

[Aleksandrov] Of course, of course.

[Voznesenskiy] Yevgeniy Pavolovich, wouldn't it be possible for us to learn a little more detail about the work to be carried out jointly by Soviet and American specialists on the issue of teaching systems: it is mentioned in the Soviet-American statement. Will the creation of new programs for computers be regarded as copyright? Because, so far, they are not copyright. These questions are of interest to (Ivan Nikolayevich Derevyev), an electronics engineer from Odintsovo.

[Velikhov] The joint statement says that work will be carried out on creating supplies of programs for education in primary and secondary schools. First and foremost it is a question of the fact that there are two stages, so to speak, of the process as computer equipment begins to penetrate the education process. Today we are setting our selves the task of creating, so to speak, a campaign against illiteracy, to some degree, in the field of computer literacy. We are now giving information science education in the ninth and tenth grades, and this for a fairly small amount of time during the week. In the future, as computers penetrate more deeply and there are fuller opportunities for using them, they will help to teach subjects like humanitarian subjects, history, geography, literature, and so on; and this will begin not from the ninth and tenth grades but from the first grade.

It is understood that it will be this deeper penetration in which the leading role is given to the teacher, because ultimately the computer is only there to help him; but the methods of teaching will have to be rearranged. This we will work out together, taking into consideration the fact that certain systems have been worked out in the United States and in the USSR.

In the Siberian branch a very great deal has been done in this respect, they have 8 years of experience there; and there is some experience in Moscow. However, there are also mistakes -- of which there have been quite a lot in both the United States and in our country -- and it's the job of the program to ensure that these mistakes are not repeated, that lessons are learned from them, and that this education is made deeper.

The second question which has been asked is of wider significance. In 1983 a decision was taken that supplies of programs should become a marketable product and the issue is now being worked on -- I think you will no doubt know more about this, about how things stand with regard to copyright?

[Nayashkov] Yevgeniy Pavolovich is right, of course. The volume of output connected with the programing of electronic computers now exceeds in value the value of the computers themselves. Firms throughout the world, therefore, have a direct interest in imparting a legal character to the process of marketing programs. Work is now being done within the framework of the International Organization for the Protection of Industrial Property in the search for the best way of giving mathematical programs legal protection. On the whole, today, the protection of programs is being examined not along the lines that inventions, for example, are protected and defended, but along the lines of copyright. Together with our Soviet legal experts and jurists, we are now working on choosing our own national program for ourselves, too. This will take time; everything has to be weighed up and assessed, but we are moving toward that.

[Voznesenskiy] (Vladimir Pavlovich Bergman), an engineer, telephones us as follows: The draft basic guidelines set the task of ensuring that the reliability of machines, equipment and instruments is raised by between 1.5 and 2 times. How do things stand with regard to the solution of this problem in machine-tool building, the leading branch of machine-building? One thing is clear: if the question of the reliability of equipment, machines, and instruments is not solved, and also that of the organization of their rational use, technical servicing and repair, then the problem of automation will not be solved either. Approximately the same questions are asked by Vyacheslav Kirillovich Korol, an engineer, and he concludes the long question that he asks with the following supplementary question: When will the machine-tool builders begin to have to answer seriously for the quality of their equipment? Ivan Stepanovich, if you please:

[Silayev] I would like to take the question in a somewhat broader context.

[Voznesenskiy] Please do so.

[Silayev] The task of making a radical improvement in quality and reliability has indeed been set in the basic directions, and this is to be done within a short time-scale. It cannot be said that our country has not tackled this question in the past. And today it is possible to give quite a lot of examples of highly reliable, highly efficient equipment, both in machine-building and in consumer goods, in the light industry. Nevertheless, of course, we ourselves, and the whole Soviet people are not satisfied with the present state of quality. What is to be done? Here, too, I would say, a new approach, a more large-scale approach, is being applied to improving quality. In the past -- and we continue to do this today -- we put the main center of attention on the goods leaving the process, on evaluating the finished output; we gave this evaluation on an assessment of its reliability in operation. And, in the main, in the areas of production and operation there were lots of decisions of all kinds, programs, and these were carried out and will continue to be carried out, concerning responsibility for quality discipline and raising skill levels.

But that is not enough. Today it is essential -- and this is the task that has been set -- to go right back to the beginning of the process, to the scientists and designers. For if the level of quality and reliability that is necessary, that is required and has been prescribed, is not built in with definite calculations, on the basis of definite, so to speak, scientific grounding, then it will be impossible to obtain that level of quality in serial production. Very serious material expenditure is therefore envisaged on this question. It is envisaged that the experimental bases and the technical equipping of our development workers will be strengthened. And these are things we have been able to work out in advance, knowing what is necessary and building in these levels of reliability. And this output will not be let out to the consumer for him to find out the shortcomings that are taking place, but this will be done on test-beds, simulation beds, half-size and full size, in order to bring out all the things that the designers for one reason or another have not foreseen. And the output will be delivered to the customer in a ready and finished state, so that in operation it will confirm the reliability that has been built into it. That is how this issue stands today. And of course this affects machine-tool building in full measure. The observation is a just one, the claims being made are real ones, machines do fail and they are not cheap. They must work for the maximum amount of time. This principle, therefore, that of building in quality and reliability from the work done at the scientific research institute, during the design, and of confirming this quality during tests on test beds, this, of course, is the guarantee of ensuring high quality. This means that this covers the supply of parts for assembly and not just the machine tool industry and others. And the question is posed in exactly the same way to the scientific research institutes. So the question is an integrated one -- it involves certain expenditure -- and it means solving problems that are both scientific and technical in character, and also, again, those pertaining to the human factor, that is to say raising responsibility and the quality with which jobs are carried out.

[Aleksandrov] May I add a little to what's been said?

[Voznesenskiy] Please do, Anatoliy Petrovich.

[Aleksandrov] The Academy of Sciences believes that raising the reliability of machines and mechanisms which are produced by our industry is one of the key issues, perhaps the key issue of our times. We attached great importance to this at the last elections, and first of all we changed the structure somewhat in the Academy of Sciences and have now created major machine building subdepartments. We strengthened the institute of engineering and we are now trying to unite to a substantial extent the work of the institute of engineering and the institute of metallurgy, in order that we might be able to develop for the actual design of machines actual materials corresponding in the greatest possible way to the requirements that will ensure the machine has a high level of reliability. Of course, as far as questions concerning the automation of production are concerned, these elements of automation must have a service-life of no less than 2 years before failure. It is extremely important to solve this task. And I also have to draw attention to the fact that over recent times science has provided a large number of ways of strengthening materials. These include the laser treatment of surfaces, the plasma treatment of surfaces, other surface treatments, the application of powders that strengthen or slow down the rate of corrosion. All these new developments must now become part of our technology full turn, so to speak. And I think that...

[Marchuk, interrupting] Excuse me. I would like to stress another side of this problem. As you see, it is a problem made up of many components, and economic levers are among these.

In just 1 month's time we will be entering 1986 and assessment of the quality of production and its technical level will be quite different from what it is today. You know that the Central Committee and the Soviet Government have adopted a decision that all output produced by industry will from 1 January 1986 be assessed in just one single category, the highest category of quality. And if it really does reach world standards, then the enterprise and the collective, naturally, which has developed and which produces this equipment will receive an addition to the price of up to 30 percent of the wholesale price. This is a very great deal, because the whole of this addition will go to the funds of the enterprise and primarily to the incentives fund. Thus one gets a good addition for a good level. And what will happen if, say, the products being turned out do not meet the highest world standards? Then 5 per cent is taken off the wholesale price immediately, even while production is being set up. And on top of this a considerable part of it is compensated for through the incentives fund, reducing the incentives fund of the enterprise and of the collective, naturally.

[Ovchinnikov] And who will decide whether or not things correspond to this world standard?

[Marchuk] The State Committee for Standards, decides as a rule. And this is done under the normal state arrangements, and I think that the question will be straightened out here. But if an enterprise does not get its output into the highest world level and does not receive a quality mark for a second year, then the wholesale price is reduced by a further 5 percent, meaning that the enterprise will no longer be able to live normally. And later it is simply taken out of production by a decree.

This is a very important thing which ultimately will stimulate all of our enterprises and even the collectives insofar as this will affect every individual and make him see to it that the highest world level is achieved. For indeed, we have been set the task -- and it is written down in the draft program of our party. It is written into the main guidelines, too, that we should get up to the world level.

And another thing, too, which will also go into operation soon and which also should be thought about today as an economic lever concerns deliveries of parts for assembly. This is a very sore point with us. Deliveries of many things are held up and many things are not produced as they should be, perhaps because of the fact that we produce goods used in their manufacture not at the right time and not in very good quality.

Let's imagine that there is an enterprise assembling a tractor. This tractor is assembled from a very large number of units, parts of different kinds which are produced by say 20 or 30 different works. And let us say that one of these works has failed to deliver the carburetor. It has to pay a penalty amounting to the cost of the carburetor which it failed to supply. But the tractor still hasn't been produced. So, from 1 January 1986, an enterprise which has not delivered this carburetor on time will pay a penalty based on the value of the whole tractor which has not been turned out onto the country's fields. This is very substantial. And if everything has been done very well, then it will receive an additional payment. So you see, economic levers which will help us to solve those problems which were described by Ivan Stepanovich and Anatoliy Petrovich are already beginning to enter our life in a very substantial way. I fully support this point of view and share it.

[Nayashkov] Lev Aleksandrovich, may I add something?

[Voznesenskiy] Please go ahead.

[Nayashkov] I would like to support the thesis of Ivan Stepanovich about the problem of reliability having to be solved primarily at the level of setting up the task and at the stage of creating the technical documentation, the technical project, and the technology for the future item of manufacture, the future machine. Unfortunately, today we have very many inventions -- I could name dozens of them -- which are being introduced most of all in repair works. There is the well-known surface hardening technology described by Anatoliy Petrovich using different powder application means, and the erosion method or the electron-ion ray application of high melting-point metals. I could also name some very simple but extremely effective inventions for production where reliability is a scourge: these are production areas linked with high temperatures, and an abrasive atmosphere, like cement works. In particular there is a bearing with an antifriction filling -- famous now on account of the discussion in the press -- which has been tested in Vladimir, for example, in processes linked with the application of paint to tractor parts. The relevant transportation trolleys remain for years in the hot production workshops and sectors instead for just 1-2 weeks, and the equipment withstands harsh operating conditions of this kind. For some reasons, all of this is being introduced extremely slowly-- not in repair shop facilities, but in basic production areas, and the technical documentation is being prepared. Unfortunately, this is a mass manifestation and of course we have to fight against it once and for all by every means.

[Voznesenskiy] It seems to me, comrades, that without suspecting this, you have replied collectively, to some extent at least, to a question from (Andrey Gennadiyevich Terlin), a post-graduate student, who asked how in fact the State Committee for Science and Technology expects to exercise control and assessment of the technical level of the national economy and production. True, there is an additional point here: Would it not be sensible to give these functions to the state system for scientific and technical information?

And a second question from an institute worker belonging to the Science and Technology Committee, Comrade Petrov, who says that great importance is now being attached to scientific and technical information: Why is the time-scale for the creation of a state system for scientific and technical information being drawn out? Is the question correct in the way it is put?

[Marchuk] I think there are some things we can say here. First, we have in our country an organization called the State Standards Committee -- we have already mentioned it -- which investigates the level, the technical level, of all production in the country, but which does so taking into consideration the exceptional importance of the most important production of the national economy, and there are not all that many items of these accoridng to the list of them, something like 800 or more items or units. But they are the things which ultimately account for the greatest volume of production -- tractors, for example, which are produced by the hundreds of thousands; motor vehicles; television receivers; and so on. As far as this production is concerned, state commissions are formed and they work in close cooperation with and under the leadership of the State Committee for Science and Technology. I think this system is the correct one, for it makes it possible to examine, outside the department, those issues which are very important in the economic and technical level for the whole of the national economy. Because, if we take the whole volume of production being turned out on this list, we find that it accounts for nearly one-half of our potential.

But, of course, information is essential here. And first and foremost this information must take shape in the scientific research institutes and in those ministries which have responsibility for output.

For no one can trace and pick up in good time tendencies in changes in techniques and technologies and even scientific ideas in the way that they are received -- and do this better than the ministries and the collectives which are working. The future of our information system, therefore, which is already being put down today, is a distributed base of data which will be accompanied by collective professional and highly responsible scientists and specialists. And there must also be access to the most important data which determine the technical level of the most important output. This is evidently the job of the State Standards Committee and the Committee of Science and Technology. But, of course, there is a great deal more that is not yet resolved in this problem, and life and the rate of development of scientific and technical progress require that information is available to every individual more rapidly and promptly.

And in this sense we are now working on the automated system, the information system of the country. This is a big question but it will solve...this problem and this system must solve the question of the information backup for scientific and technical progress.

[Voznesenskiy] Yuriy Anatoliyevich, I have mentioned two of our roles. But the comrades TV viewers have recalled a third one. This was done by scientific staff member Vladimir Semenovich Bulygin who addressed you. He says the following: The acceleration of scientific and technical progress is determined also by increased labor discipline, one of the factors of which is the struggling against drunkenness and alcoholism. Availing myself of the fact that present here is Comrade Ovchinnikov, chairman of the All-Union Society for the Struggle for Sobriety I would like to find out his view as the leader of this society: Is the complete giving up of the consumption of alcoholic drinks an indispensable condition for membership of the society? Apparently, such a program is difficult to carry. But, perhaps, the leadership of the society will offer its members examples for imitation?

[Ovchinnikov] Well, I would answer this question first of all as follows: that the Society for the Struggle for Sobriety is setting as its task the liquidation of those negative phenomena which today exist in our country -- and of which we are well aware -- connected with fairly widespread drunkenness and alcoholism. This is causing damage to our economy. I believe that this is evidence of the insufficient cultural level of many representatives. And, apart from that, this is of course not at all in accordance with these high ideals which our people and our state set, being the leading country of socialism. Now, if one is to speak of our specific tasks, at present the formation of the entire structure of the Society for the Struggle for Sobriety is in progress. We have already proceeded to setting up primary organizations. And, of course, in order to be a member of the society, giving up the consumption of liquor and alcoholic drinks is compulsory. I must stress that it has been well established that the consumption of alcoholic drinks, especially uncontrolled consumption, causes very great harm to man. Facts now at our disposal show that this is especially fraught with serious consequences for the young generation, for women, for the future of our entire people and therefore we believe that membership of the society, and not only membership of the society but the function, the mission of each member of the society is such that he should be a consistent fighter for the complete exclusion of the consumption of alcholic drinks.

[Vozesenskiy] Here are a number of questions which concern the problems of space, problems of the utilization of thermo-nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, problems of computerization. These questions I have handed over to Yevgeniy Pavlovich, and at your choice, you can answer, if only a few of them.

[Velikhov] That means I will not enumerate them then, I will simply try to generalize because I have a whole large number of them here.

[Voznesenskiy] When, where this is convenient to you, tell us, please if only the surnames and towns.

[Velikhov] Moscow, Petrov, Moscow, Ruzhitskiy. These questions about thermonuclear fusion.

The first question asked is about our country's successes in the construction of Tokamaks. It must be said that the idea itself of Tokamaks was developed and its promise was proved. By today it is precisely this installation which has been chosen as...and recognized throughout the world as the main candidate for a possible thermonuclear reactor. It was developed in our country, in the Kurchatov Atomic Energy Institute. The first superconductive Tokamak was built at the Atomic Energy Institute. Then, after the successes of the Tokamaks had been recognized throughout the world, all countries became involved in this matter: Europe, the United States of America, Japan. For this reason the volume of this work is colossal throughout the world. Such is the situation today on the whole as regards the Tokamaks. Well, it needs to be said that today the necessary temperature has been obtained, which is five times higher than in the center of the sun, of the order...Well, 100 million degrees has been obtained. The necessary thermal insulation has been obtained, it is true to say, not at the maximum temperature. Finally, all...many...most of the main parameters, which we need for the reactors, have been obtained. Although these are only scientific ones. So far we have to all intents and purposes not made a start on technological questions. And this is the following step. The task now is to pool the obtaining of all these parameters in one installation. Of course, there is still very much in nature that is hidden, but now our idea is that nature has already presented us with our main nuisances, so to speak. Of late we have, all the same, been obtaining very positive, optimistic results in the study of physics, of how the retaining of such a substance takes place at colossal temperatures of a space scale.

The second question is: Can thermonuclear weapons be used for obtaining electric power? Speaking in general, there have been such plans which show that it is possible to carry out peaceful explosion and obtain energy. Theoretically, this is a possible way, but it needs to be said, it is fairly complicated. Although, of course, it is a pleasant one, we can take all thermonuclear weapons and use them in order to obtain a large quantity of energy. But it needs to be said, that all the same this is a very large explosion and therefore converting its explosive energy into energy which is useful to man is a very complicated technical question, and we have no experience of that.

As regards computers, what is being said here? There are very many questions. One, well the main question, all the same, boils down to the following: When will mass personal computers be produced and in what quantities? You know that the 5-year plan is now being developed. According to the assessment of the Academy of Sciences regarding needs we believe that in the next 5-year plan period on the scale of a million computers should be produced, taking into account the needs of school and education, engineers, the economy, agriculture, etc. They are to develop, roughly speaking, into two types of computers. One, whose cost is measured somewhere in the region of several hundreds of roubles, on the scale of a school and domestic computer, and a considerably more complicated engineering computer which will cost already thousands of roubles. Today we have very interesting examples. On the whole, we have started the creation of the first personal computers fairly long ago, say 226-Iskra, a very popular machine, a state prize was received for its development.

It is very popular with scientists, economists, but so far is being produced on a very small scale. The main thing now is to change over to the large scale of which I have spoken.

Well, if you like, I have tried to reply briefly.

[Voznesenskiy] I would like, comrades, to prove by one small example that we are, all the same, living in the century of scientific and technical progress and it is not only notes with viewers' questions which are landing on our table. There are more weighty items [laughs] received by telephone.. [picks up an engineering cutting tool from his table]

Well, joking apart, what we have here are, perhaps, new types of cutting-tools, which, judging from the documents attached to these cutting-tools -- and Anatoliy Petrovich, I see, has already taken an interest in them -- prove to be extremely efficient, far more durable, and correspondingly far more economical. And the inventor of these cutting-tools is Yulyan Borisovich Kapilevich, candidate of technical sciences from Novosibirsk, who says the following:

In the basic guidelines, in the section about the development of the machine-tool industry and the tool industry, it says: The specialized production of tools is to be developed with a view to putting a stop to work done by primitive methods. While many enterprises in the country are forced to manufacture cutting tools and milling cutters at a high price and of low quality, I propose that the above-mentioned point should be written as follows in the basic guidelines: The standardization of tools and their centralized manufacture should be implemented using new highly-productive processes which raise the quality and economicalness of tools.

What is your attitude to this as an idea, Ivan Stepanovich?

[Silayev] The question is a very topical one for us today. Because the consumption of tools, in connection with the use of highly-productive equipment, is a very acute problem. While previously we worked with one tool on a general purpose lathe -- the turner could take away, grind, and come to work without hurrying, today when a worker is operating a machining center, he has up to 100 tools in his magazine. It needs to be fully loaded and must operate faultlessly, reliably, for a long time. Production itself, the scale of production of tools, is increasing. And the basic guidelines provide in particular for the construction of specialized tool works. But, of course, it is very important to us that tools should serve reliably, for a long time, and should not let us down. Various directions are being followed: Spray-coating, hard-facing, all the possible combinations including what the comrade proposes. This is of interest. I think the best thing to do is, if you have no objections, is to give me these materials. We will do a bit of work on them in our own place and we will reply.

[Voznesenskiy] I will accept the opportunity and I will do it immediately because, having acquainted myself with the material, I think there is a serious subject for thought.

[Silayev] Obviously! [video shows Voznesenskiy reaching over to Silayev, and handing him the cutting tool together with documents]

[Silayev] Thanks.

[Voznesenskiy] Please hand over these things from [words indistinct]

[Nayashkov] Now the viewers have seen you handing over the sample, from now on the parcels will come without delay straight to the television center.

[Voznesenskiy] Well, since you have put forward such an idea, I have to tell you at once, that I don't have a technical education and that I will not be able to react fittingly without your assistance in a technically competent fashion. Therefore, it would be better if parcels of this kind go straight to those state organizations which, by the nature of their activity, are called upon to react to such kinds of serious ideas and proposals.

[Aleksandrov] Lev Aleksandrovich, all the same, tell the person who sent you this proposal that the proposal is a correct one, a proposal of the kind which needs to be included in the basic guidelines. It seems to me, Guriy Ivanovich, that both you and I can do this?

[Marchuk] Yes!

[Voznesenskiy] Here is one more proposal to include the "design" problem in the basic guidelines. This comes from (Aleksandr Alekseyevich Atlanov), from Tashkent, and from the other corner of the country Yuriy Nikolayevich Baloshev from Tallinn. These comrades think it would be necessary for the role of design, which is of immense importance in the development of present day equipment, to be reflected in the basic guidelines for the development of the national economy, and ask: What measures in the development of design in the USSR will be taken? If you could answer this question briefly, please.

[Marchuk] Well, I can speak about this.

[Voznesenskiy] Please, go ahead.

[Marchuk] Of course, the question of design is becoming increasingly acute because design does not only include beauty, not only elegance and a pleasant form, but also comfort at work. It is, in fact, a combination with ergonomics: that which creates an infrastructure for man who uses some other material, device, or machine.

[Voznesenskiy] And, consequently, Guriy Ivanovich, labor productivity is being raised.

[Marchuk] Absolutely correct! But apart from that there is also another aspect. Because people very much wish to possess things that are beautiful, pleasant, comfortable, fashionable, be it a television set, a refrigerator, or a dress. For this reason novelties in this sense and design go together. It needs to be said that if one looks broadly at this problem, one sees that design already determines the consumer qualities of articles and goods now. And for this reason if we now wish for, and set the task to reach, world standard, we can only do so if we pool technical, technological aspects, and design in a broad plane. At present the country is preparing, and there already is a large design program. In many republics there are branches of the Central Institute. Design is, in fact, turning into some kind of state standard for forms, for novelty for fashion, for aesthetics. For this reason it is difficult to overestimate the emphasis which is now being placed on design.

[Words **indistinct** as several speakers speak at once]

[Aleksandrov] Guriy Ivanovich, some legislative documents already exist in this connection now; today I signed technical specifications for a number of instruments which will be produced by our instrument making organizations.

And in this case design requirements have already been included.

[Marchuk] Correct. They exist. The Central Institute for Design has powers and in fact implements this policy.

[Nayashkov] Lev Aleksandrovich, I would like to (?add)...

[Voznesenskiy] Go ahead Ivan Semenovich.

[Nayashkov] I would like to add to what Guriy Ivanovich and Anatoliy Petrovich said by saying that in the Committee for Inventions there is a wish to raise the rewards for production prototypes. This is legal protection (dealing with) these problems of design mentioned here. Today we register some 1,500-2,000 production prototypes in the country. And the number of such proposals for the protection of production prototypes is increasing every year. It is true that the pace could of course be better. This is the addition on behalf of the Committee For Inventions and Discoveries, Lev Aleksandrovich. So there is a whole series of steps which are tackling the problem of design.

[Voznesenskiy] Each of our guests already has a great many questions, but I think that Anatoliy Petrovich has more unanswered questions than anyone else. Please choose which you would like to answer.

[Aleksandrov] From Comrade Khabinskiy, a pensioner from Chernobyl. I live near an atomic power station. Can the heat from the power station be used to supply Chernobyl? The answer is yes, and the development work is in progress. From Lev Nikolayevich Belikov, an engineer from Moscow: He asks how is the development of fast neutron reactors proceeding? Well, it is well known that we built the first fast neutron reactor about 15 years ago on the Mangyshlak Peninsula, after which the town of Shevchenko was built. That was our very first reactor. Since then they have been improved, their capacity has been enlarged, and now that development work is continuing. We have built a 600,000 kw reactor and a 800,000 kw reactor. Quite a large series of 800,000 kw reactors will be built, and development work is currently in progress on reactors with larger capacities. A question [as heard] for Aleksandrov: "When will chemical enterprises utilizing the heat of nuclear reactors start to be built? This is asked by Aleksandr Olegovich Goltsev, a physicist from Moscow. Comrade Goltsev, I would like to know the same thing, so I am forwarding your question to the State Planning Committee.

[Voznesenskiy] I hope, Anatoliy Petrovich, that representatives of the State Planning Committee will be taking part in our precongress broadcasts, so we will also ask them that question.

[Aleksandrov] All right. Now, Anatoliy Vasiliyevich Nidaivoda, a diesel engine driver from Ekibastuz, asks: Could we carry out fewer spacecraft launches and use the money to build irrigation channels and tractors, plow up our Kazakhstan desert land and grow grain crops on it? Well, you know, spacecraft are not just launched for the sake of amusement. The work that they do is concrete and most important. For example, we now have a very developed system of satellite communications between our cities. A great deal of work is being done to study the surface of our earth from space, which incidentally leads, among other things, to increasing crop yields, and so on and so forth. Our state decides where money should be spent in the optimum way. The State Planning Committee prepares the material and reports to the Central Committee and the government, and decisions are taken and all the funds are allocated for all the requirements. So while you are right to say that various aspects must be taken into consideration here, you mustn't think that if we reduce the number of space launches, this will immediately solve the problem of Kazakhstan.

A question from the Moldavian Selkhoztekhnika Directorate: Corrosion eats away 100,000 metric tons of metal. This is a particular catastrophe in the agro-industrial complex, and there is an insufficient amount of protection coatings. What new things are being developed in this area, and what does the chemical industry think about increasing the output of coating agents? We have already said in our replies to the questions here that powder technology, surface treatment and hardfacing are all being used to reduce both corrosion and wear. This work is now being done on a wide scale in our country and I think that... Well, I could give the following illustration: If instead of paint we use an aluminized surface for metal structures, we can increase the life of the paint covering from one or two years to 20 or 25 years. That is how effective it is. So many areas here are being developed, and the chemical industry is working on this as well, and I think that things are going fine.

[Voznesenskiy] Anatoliy Petrovich, I think it might be a good idea to somehow systematize these questions...

[Aleksandrov] Yes, Yes.

[Voznesenskiy] ... So while you are doing that I will ask Yuriy Anatoliyevich to answer a few of the questions that he, too, has accumulated.

[Ovchinnikov] Yes, in brief, then. Comrade Konstantin Petrovich Kudryavtsev from Moscow, an economist, asks the following: In the context of the party and government resolution on strengthening the medical industry, there has been a merging of the medical industry with microbiology. Is this expedient, and were the suggestions by workers in the medical industry and microbiology heard? Well, I would like to say that a great many suggestions were heard and they were weighed in detail. In addition, in my view, it is expedient, because our microbiology sector is extremely progressive and employs very modern biological methods, while in medicine the processes such as those for obtaining vaccines and antibiotics are based on biological methods, and the resolution really does provide for the modernization, so to speak of all this technology of ours and the solution of urgent tasks in medicine. What are the prospects for the development of the biological center of the Academy of Sciences. That, I think, is the one at Pushchino. Well, the situation is that we are not going to be creating new institutes there, but we will strengthen the experimental base and over the next few years we want to solve questions of housing, particularly for young people. I think that the center will develop in an extremely good way. Comrade Sagdeyev from Leninogorskiy Rayon asks: Reports have recently been appearing in farming magazines about biological land cultivation, in other words without the use of chemicals. What are the prospects for this?

All in all, it's a fine dream, and science is working along this direction, however, we will still have to use chemicals for a long time to come, and this is the trend throughout the world; but we do have an institute in our country that is engaged in these biological methods, and it is in Kishinev. Next: What significance will the construction of a protein and vitamin combine have for the oblast and the rayon, and what is its role from the scientific point of view? And another question related to this: Is any work being done in the Soviet Union on the fermentation of straw, and what are the prospects for it. Well, I should say that valuable feed additives -- vitamin and other additives -- are obtained based on straw, natural gas, oil and certain spirits, and these have proved their worth in agriculture. Such an enterprise today can be based on extremely modern technology that does not pollute the environment, and I think that the building of such plants in certain areas should be extremely welcome. Finally, there are a few questions on the production of insulin. They ask what are the prospects for the treatment of diabetes, and what is the situation with regard to the production of human insulin?

I should like to stress that the Academy of Sciences has completed the development of a genetic engineering method of obtaining human insulin: This in fact is a preparation that is present in the human body, so that the sometimes not very effective animal insulin does not have to be used. This is now being introduced. It is being introduced at the new ministry that has just been set up, and I am under the impression that it is being introduced quite rapidly. So that I think in a year or 2 taking into account the need for medical trials, this preparation will be available at pharmacies. So that's it briefly for now, Lev Aleksandrovich.

[Voznesenskiy] Yes, thank you for such a brief and at the same time ample reply. Ivan Semenovich, over to you.

[Nayashkov] Lev Aleksandrovich, the largest number of questions that I have here concern the drawing up of a new law. Comrade Kushnir from Kharkov, Comrade Kazakov from Moscow, Comrade Morkov from the town of (Sosygurets) and Comrade Ismanskiy ask when a new law on inventions is to be published. I have already spoken about this law. Our plan is to prepare the (?draw) law in January, and we hope that the draft law will be made available to inventors, above all, and also to organizations and enterprises so that they can pass judgment on it before it is enacted. We would like public opinion to have a certain say before the law is passed, and then, taking account of all the proposals that are forthcoming, we will be able to submit it for enactment.

There are also questions here -- very crucial questions -- for instance from Comrade Blokhin, who has rung in from Moscow to ask whether, when a patent is issued, the responsibility of organizations for the application of the invention can at the same time be established. We should like to bring in a regulation of this sort in the new law, Lev Aleksandrovich, since it seems to us that the absence of responsibility on the part of enterprises today for the fate of inventions -- even inventions made at the enterprises -- is in a quite definite manner holding up the period in which it takes to make use of inventions.

There are also comments here about red tape in the application of inventions -- this is also a vexing question. What I should like to say is this. Today we really do have a gap between the planning of new equipment and technology, and incidentally its application, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the planning, devising and use of inventions. As a result of this sort of imbalanced planning inventions are shortlived and sometimes are knocked stone dead. New technology is created without the inventions. And in the meantime if planning work is correctly organized, such as at the Leningrad metal plant then the problem of the timely use of inventions does not exist. The comrades there have set up a very simple system. If new technology is being brought in, the general director of the Leningrad metal plant association himself, no less, checks whether the new equipment, the new turbine, say, incorporates inventions, and what level of inventions they are. Today 30 per cent of the output of the works is exported. It is no coincidence that without allowing a rift to form between the planning of new equipment and inventions, the works annually, every 5-year plan period, increases the number of licences sold. For instance, one licence was sold in the 9th 5-year plan 6 licences were sold in the last 5-year plan, and in the first 4 years of the current 5-year plan 17 licences have already been sold. This is thanks to the correct planning of the technical level simultaneously with targets for all technical parameters.

There are also some other questions, in particular a very vexing issue which directly concerns us, Lev Aleksandrovich: When and how will measures be undertaken by the USSR State Committee for Inventions and Discoveries to reduce the period of time which elapses between the submission of claims and the making of decisions. Today we really do receive applications on a massive scale. Today the average period -- although I daresay that no one will be happy with the average -- the average period between the arrival of a claim and the adoption of a positive decision comes to 11 or 12 months. I can tell you that today we have 1 and 1/2... [corrects himself] 150,000 inventions, that is, applications with details of inventions, and I must admit that our thousands of experts are not managing to cut the period it takes to examine applications to the established 6 months. We are now taking steps to provide our experts with new technical facilities for seeking information during their research, and as a result to improve the quality of the expert examination of applications, above all, and at the same time to reduce the time it takes for applications to be considered. The committee is working on this.

There are also some questions here connected with, again, the conservatism of a certain number of people involved in the process from the start, the inception of a technical solution to actual production. We believe this is not least a matter for the plan. The country and the USSR State Planning Committee, in particular, are taking steps to perfect the planning system, and this applies not just to Gosplan, but ministries are also working on perfecting the planning system and production planning will solve the problem of cutting the time between the inception of an idea, of technical solutions, and their application in the national economy.

This is an overall state problem, and we are called upon to solve it by both the party program and, even more, the basic guidelines for our country's economic and social development in the next 5-year plan period and up to the year 2000. There are some more questions, lots more questions.

[Voznesenskiy] Yes, I know there are some more questions, but I think all of us are starting to look at the clock with a certain amount of alarm. So please allow me to hand the floor to another of our guests. Ivan Stepanovich, strange as it may seem I shall ask you to start, not with words but with action. We have had a telephone request from the city of Donetsk to show a cutting tool in closeup. Please could you show us an old cutting tool, and at least one of the new ones.

[Nayashkov] The power of television (?brought into play)!

[Voznesenskiy] Yes! [video shows Silayev lifting papers on the table and picking up a cutting tool which he then holds in his hand for the camera to view in closeup] So here we have what? A hardfaced cutter, isn't it?

[Silayev] Yes, that's right. It's composite plate.

[Voznesenskiy] And the other cutter is a single piece? [video shows Silayev picking up and disassembling another cutter, demonstrating its parts]

[Silayev] No, it's not. First of all, this part is the holder, and the cutter part is also hardfaced.

[Voznesenskiy] Its's also hardfaced?

[Silayev] Yes. [video shows Aleksandrov leaning across to remove and demonstrate an insertion piece from the bottom of the cutter]

[Aleksandrov] And this bit is coated with titanium nitride to increase its strength.

[Voznesenskiy] Right! Well, after that little demonstration I shall ask you to answer at least some of your questions.

[Silayev] Lev Aleksandrovich, viewers' questions indicate that machine tool building really is one of the most important sectors which has a direct effect on technological progress. I would like to comment on a few questions, including from Comrade Kuznetsov from Leningrad, Comrade Gusin from Vladimir, and Comrade Kolesnikov from Moscow. They ask the same question, the sense of which is as follows. First, have we not been hasty with our attempts to introduce flexible automated production systems? Won't our losses exceed our profits? Next, how do things stand scientifically with the introduction of these flexible automated production systems for small-batch production, where flexibility is achieved at the cost of appreciable losses -- in other words there are losses in small-batch production? First of all, is it not too early to introduce them? No, it isn't! The figures speak for themselves. In our country today there are more machine tools than there are machine tool operators, and it is not envisaged that their number will increase. So we have to replace a colossal number of old, universal equipment with modern, highly-productive equipment, including flexible automated production systems. But these systems are not just a fashion. The systems, the flexible adaptable production lines, have their place in the overall process. And where there is small-batch production, where there is even medium-sized batch production, and where adaptation is needed even within a shift -- not to mention within longer periods -- the flexible automated production system plays a decisive role. But it cannot of course replace the automatic lines in mass production where the same operations are carried but and where the productivity is immeasurably higher. In other words, there is a definite direction here, and the flexible automated production system is nevertheless a revolution. It releases a colossal number of people, machine tool operators, and raises productivity, not to mention quality, precision and so on.

But of course if anyone wants to acquire such a system he will not simply be able to use it straight away. He will have to carry out preparations, he will have to train his staff, he will have to prepare the work stations. He will have, if you like, to prove his ability to put an expensive flexible automated production system into operation and from the very first few days to get the necessary productivity from it. And there is the question of cost, of course - as with every new venture, particularly at the early stages, there is a considerable increase in costs. But the task in the 12th 5-year plan is to ensure that the increase in the cost of these machining centers and flexible automated production systems as a whole must not run ahead of the increase in labor productivity. The picture must be the reverse: the increase in cost must be somewhat lower than the degree of increase in productivity. This is a realistic task which we face today, and I think that it will be achieved. I cannot fail to reply to questions which of course will also interest Anatoliy Petrovich: Comrade Nikitin from Moscow asks whether in the next 5-year plan period Soviet scientific instrument-making will reach the level of world standards in the development of equipment for use not just in scientific establishments but also in industry, for automated control systems, for diagnosis and control. This problem really does exist, but I would not talk about the level of world standards here because in a number of cases, if not in many cases, we are talking of unique equipment for which scientists must conduct basic research, studies and experiments. There are problems here today.

Guriy Ivanovich, Anatoliy Ivanovich, I should say Anatoliy Petrovich, and I closely considered this problem with Gosplan recently, and we came to the decision that the products which have been developed -- and "home-made" products, as they can to some extent be termed -- must be switched to industrial principles, we must develop unique products just for academic centers or large centers concerned with individual industries -- not expensive, complex, and unique ones [as heard] we must create equipment of medium complexity which could be used both in scientific experiments and in factory experiments, and, finally, we must develop equipment for larger-scale production which, let's say, will be tackling minor matters, practical matters, in science, and will provide the necessary range of diagnostic and control equipment for series production too. In this way this question has already been given an airing, we believe that it has been formulated correctly, and in the 12th 5-year plan we shall unquestionably resolve this matter. Well, I have a whole set of further questions, but I can see that our time is running out.

[Voznesenskiy] You are right. And I think perhaps that we should now make an attempt to let each of our guests have an opportunity to say his concluding -- or almost concluding -- words. Yevgeniy Pavlovich, would you like to share your ideas, please, about the questions you have in your hands?

[Velikhov] I have a whole set of questions. These questions are connected first of all with space. Here there are three -- four even -- questions which are directly opposed to each other. The first amounts to this: Do we know exactly what is the orbit of Halley's Comet? This is asked for a number of reasons by Mikhaylov from the city of Moscow. We intend to organize a meeting with the Vega space craft which is now flying to meet Halley's Comet. We therefore know both the orbit of Halley's Comet and the orbit of the Vega guided vehicle with a very high level of precision. The second question is this: the Americans have landed people on the Moon using shuttle spacecraft, asks Kozin, a pensioner from Klin. How do things stand with us in this area? I have to say that this is not absolutely correct. People were landed on the Moon using systems designed for one single mission. I have to say that our space program proceeds from our own interests, interests pertaining primarily to the national economy and science. One of our main achievements at the present time is the very prolonged space flight by man. As far as the planets of the solar system are concerned, we use automatic craft because these are much cheaper and more effective. In this connection there is the question about research into Venus, how important and interesting this is, but once again the question is how effective is this for the national economy? I would like to say that first of all man is different by virtue of the fact that he wants to find out a great deal for the sake of knowledge itself, for the sake of moving forward the frontiers of what is known. And later this brings enormous benefit always, because when we make substantial advances -- and this includes space -- then this always gives us a very great deal in terms of practical results. I just do not have time to talk about this in detail. I would like, therefore, to move away from the whole of this circle of space questions to a question concerning the state of computer technology in the Soviet Union. I have already said that we are embarking upon the mass production of machines, moving from thousands to millions. This is a very important point which will occur during the coming 5-year plan, in mass production. From point of view of the achievements of computer technology the very fact that a flight is being made to the Halley's Comet shows that we have computer resources on board the space vehicle and means for calculating the trajectory. At the same time we do have a certain lagging behind as far as computer equipment is concerned in the area of quality, although there are some very interesting developments and we expect that the lagging behind which we have at the moment will be eliminated during the next 5-year plan through concentrating efforts both in science and in industry in this direction. Ivan Stepanovich has already mentioned this.

[Voznesenskiy] Thank you, Yevgeniy Pavlovich. Ivan Semenovich please, a few words.

[Nayashkov] I'll be very brief. I think that there must be no doubt that technical progress is impossible without inventions. In connection with this it is our common task, the task of the ministries, the scientific centers and the enterprises, to do everything to ensure that more inventions are created, inventions that are more effective, while we for our part will de everything to speed up their examination and implementation.

[Voznesenskiy] Yuriy Anatoliyevich:

[Ovchinnikov] A question which has been asked here by many comrades is linked with the speed at which biological science is going to develop in our country and the degree to which it will serve the interests of man. I must stress that this is the main task of the whole of our work linked with medicine and agriculture. It is primarily aimed at solving the most complicated problems linked with man. And in connection with this I would no doubt reply in the negative to the question: Do we need a special institute for integrated research into the human being. All institutes, the chemical, biological, medical and agricultural institutes, the social science institutes, so to speak, must all deal with the human being, and this kind of integrated program is now being created in our Academy and I think that it will develop in a very intensive way so that our country's positions in this very important direction are in the front line.

[Voznesenskiy] Thank you. Guriy Ivanovich, please.

[Marchuk] I would like to say that I have a very large number of questions linked with raising the efficiency of the activity of scientific research institutes, of industry-based science.

[Voznesenskiy] Science in the higher educational establishments?

[Marchuk] Science in the higher educational establishments. I think this could be a subject for special examination. But I would like to say that this is my conculsion. Over the past few years, you know, perhaps 10 years, scientific research institutes -- particularly those of the industries -- have not been working at full pressure and this has been determined not just be internal faults of various kinds -- because people have been striving to be a lot -- but the results have not always found their way into life. And here is must be said that a role has been played by the extensive factor in our economy to a considerable extent: We have built many new things, we have repeated known things, and now there is a about-turn taking place. Now we are going over to an intensive economy. The main pivot now, both in the party's program and in the basic guidelines, is reconstruction, technical refurbishment, and modernization. These are the main levers which will provide the possibility for customers for science to be defined. And I am absolutely convinced that the main factor in raising the intensification of scientific labor will make its appearance when the task is solved about customers for this new innovation. This is something that life requires. I think, therefore, that we must remember this today: and of course as well as this there are still many problems of purely organizational nature which we are now solving. From 1 January, for example, there is tne new payment for the labor of scientific staff.

[Voznesenskiy] There are a lot of questions in this connection.

[Marchuk] There are a lot of questions about this, and preparations have to be made for this. The criteria have to be drawn up accurately. But the main thing is the ultimate objective. Of course, academic science stands out here because it has always moved forward and has given us an enormous quantity of "work-pieces", if I may use that phrase, for more industry-based science.

The task now is to unite all these forces and to use them for action.

[Voznesenskiy] After those words I think we must invite the leader of this academic science to say a few words. Anatoliy Petrovich, please.

[Aleksandrov] Dear Comrade television viewers! I must say that it has given me great pleasure to take part in our joint appearance today. It shows in the questions which we have received and to which I have no opportunity to reply because it is already time for us to finish, it shows how they reflect as in a mirror the very deep level of interest of our people in scientific and technical progress, in the further improvement of our production and so on. Truly, this is simply too difficult to express. Just look: Mazanov, Yurily Nikolayevich asks: What work is being done in the development of new types of communications? [Krovenskiy] From the Sverdlovsk oblast says: In the scientific and technical progress of our industry a great role has been played by the introduction of miniature atomic reactors, in rail transportation, for example. And so on. The large number of such questions shows, comrades, just how acutely interested all our people really are in scientific and technical progress. Insofar as we all work in precisely this area, at any rate we try to bring as much benefit as possible here, well it seems to me that this is extremely important, this situation.

[Voznesenskiy] It seems to me that in conclusion we should no doubt add another aspect of the problem which, along with many others, remains not dealt with today. It is, nevertheless, an extremely important aspect. [Vasiliy Alekseyevich Minayev], a schoolteacher from Sterlitamak put it to us. In his question he raises the problem like this: that scientific and technical progress must be linked inseparably with the economic management of the national economy, with the achievement of the greatest results for the least possible expenditure. It seems to me that this is an extremely important side of the problem, and I hope that we will again have an opportunity, in one form or another, to return to a discussion of it either before the congress or after the congress.

And now comrade television viewers, sad though it is to part with you and with such interesting speakers as those who have been with us today, our program has reached the end of its allotted time. Before, I say goodbye to you I want to say that during our last program, which if you remember was devoted to the development of the sciences sphere, we received 785 questions from you, of which nearly one-half came in from other cities besides Moscow.

In addition to that we received more that 1,200 letters. All of them have been handed over to the ministries where the appropriate work is being done with them. And when we approach the problems of raising the standard of living of the people in our precongress broadcasts, we will naturally return to these questions and these letters and we will try to reply to the most substantial ones among them, once again having asked those comrades to take part who took part in the previous direct broadcast, as we promised you.

In the meantime, let me say that our next broadcast will take place on 13 December. It will be devoted to the development of the country's fuel and power complex. Then we will discuss questions concerning the formation of the agro-industrial complex more and the implementation of the food program.

Later on we will address the development of the production of consumer goods and issues in general relating to lifting the standard of living of the people, improving further the work of all types of transport, and we will end the series with discussion of problems relating to environmental protection and the rational use of natural resources. Throughout the whole of this time up to the congress you will be able to ask your questions and put forward your proposals both in letters addressed to central television and phone on number 215-24-02. And, as always during the program themselves, all the telephones which have been working today will be in operation and as before you will be able to telephone direct in to the studio. All your proposals and observations linked with the discussion of the precongress documents of the party will naturally be sorted out and will be handed over for careful attention.

So now I express our thanks to those who have taken part in the program for their interesting words, and I thank you, comrade television viewers, for the questions which have been no less interesting. All the best to you. [Entire program is presented from a studio set. There are no films shown.]

BRIEFS

AUTOMATED DESIGN SYSTEM -- Experimental use of the first stage of an automated design system has begun at the Kharkov atomic turbine construction association. Computers have been used to design 1 million kw turbines capable of generating power, heat, and hot water. The computer picked the optimum design from a variety of options. The enterprise is now preparing for the manufacture of a new generation of turbines, 1.5 million kw in capacity. [Summary] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 30 Nov 85 LD]

KAZAKHSTAN COMPUTER CENTER -- A computer center for collective use began round-the-clock work in Alma-Ata today. It prepares mathematical calculations for dozens of enterprises and institutions in the Kazakhstan capital. As well as putting together estimates for public housing, it processes all payments documents of the town's housing directorate, telephone exchanges, and also statistical, aerogeophysical, and many other kinds of information, and manages the provision of medical equipment and preparations in the town. All calculations are communicated there and then to clients. Such centers will be opened in all industrially developed rayons of the republic in the new 5-year plan;they are being set up now in Chimkent, Tselinograd, Aktyubinsk, and Karaganda. [Summary] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 30 Nov 85 LD]